National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVII. NO. 5. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1856. WHOLE NO. 837.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion, and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

NORRIS & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

SOUTHERN OPINIONS ON THE SUMNER OUTRAGE.

From The Richmond Enquirer, June 4.

INSOLENCE OF THE ABOLITIONISTS.

THE habitual insolence of the Abolitionists in Washington imposes upon the Representatives of the South the necessity either of shameful submission to insult and obloquy or of some appropriate and adequate redress of their grievances. To retaliate in kind would be abhorrent to all the manly instincts of Southern gentlemen, and would besides soon convert Congress into a brothel or a bear garden, where the antagonism of opposing parties would be reduced to a contest of filthy vituperation. The Abolitionist recognises no responsibility on the field of honour for words of wanton or deliberate denunciation. What recourse, then, has the Southern gentleman? If he has not been abused in person, his State and his country have been traduced, and all the finer feelings of his heart trampled upon by a beast of an Abolitionist. To endure such indignities would imply an absence of that sensibility to insult and of that fearless impulse of resentment which constitute the chivalry of the Southern character. The obligation to avenge any personal affront or libel upon his State is as keenly felt by the Southern gentleman as the duty of repelling the assault of a public enemy. This pride of personal inviolability, and this perfect readiness to confront death in vindication of his honour, impart to the character of the Southern gentleman the dignity and delicacy of sentiment which distinguish it from the habitual dispositions of any other community. With passions inflamed and pride humiliated by an intolerable insult, by what mode of redress can he satisfy his wounded sensibility, except by the infliction of personal chastisement on his adversary?

There may be some persons who contest the necessity of such violence or resentment on the part of Southern representatives, on the ground of want of adequate provocation. This objection implies an utter ignorance of the habitual tone and temper of abolition speakers. The vile and ferocious passions of their vulgar constituency find full utterance on the floor of Congress. If anybody wants an illustration of the characteristic sentiment and speech of the Abolitionists, let him turn to another column of this paper, and read the proceedings of a recent Anti-Slavery Convention in Boston. When George Washington is spit upon, and denounced as a scoundrel, it is not wonderful that Southern men are stigmatized with the most opprobrious epithets in the vocabulary of abuse.

A circumstance is disclosed in the proceedings of this Convention which still further justifies Colonel Brooks in his castigation of Sumner. It appears, from a letter to Theodore Parker, that Sumner vauntingly proclaimed a premeditated purpose to pronounce the most severe philippic ever heard in Congress. For such deliberate malice in abuse no punishment could be excessive.

But the funniest part of this affair is Wilson's pretended regret that he was not present to repel the assault upon Sumner. How very lustily this cock crows upon his own dunghill. At Washington, in presence of the persons with whom he is eager to grapple, he is as harmless as any other non-combatant. In Massachusetts he is all ablaze with indignation, and thirsts for blood with the appetite of a hungry tigress. He even boasts of having made a belligerent demonstration in front of Mr. Keitt's room! What pitiful poltroonery!

From the same paper, June 6.

THE SUMNER ASSAULT—EVERETT AN ACTOR IN THE FARCE.

The papers of the North have perpetrated such shameless mendacity in their narration of the circumstances of the Sumner chastisement, that the public will be not a little surprised by the developements of the evidence before the Committee of the House. In another column we insert the testimony of the most respectable persons who witnessed the affair.

By the concurrent statements of these gentlemen, it is incontestibly proved that Sumner was duly warned of the hostile purpose of Mr. Brooks, and that he had risen from his seat before he was stricken a single blow. It appears, besides, that he did not receive more than a dozen blows in all, and that as soon as he fell, Mr. Brooks ceased the castigation. Neither is there any dispute among the witnesses as to the conduct of Sumner. He offered not the least demonstration of fight, but only attempted to ward off the blows. It is not denied by his friends that he uttered piteous cries of distress, instead of exhibiting some effort, no matter how feeble, to resent the outrage upon his person.

Mr. Brooks's coolness and courage, as attested by all the witnesses, present the most striking contrast to the cowardice of the craven-hearted wretch from Massachusetts. Throughout the affair his conduct was characterized by equal spirit and delicacy of sentiment.

The testimony of Sumner's physician confirms the popular suspicion that the fellow is feigning an illness which he does not really suffer. It is manifest that his hurt is not at all serious, and that he might have resumed his seat in the Senate the next day if he had not been utterly prostrated and unmanned by fright. Yet the New York *Tribune* of Wednesday gravely speaks of Sumner's being beaten to death in the Senate Chamber.

There is no circumstance of this affair which so mortifies and humiliates respectable people as the conduct of Edward Everett. What sacrilege to associate the sufferings of Sumner with the memory of Washington!—to preface a eulogy on the Father of his Country with a whining cry of sympathy with an infamous traitor! It is just like Edward Everett. He has no sincerity, and no power of resistance to the frenzy of the moment. His hatred of Sumner is notorious; yet he pretends to weep over the misfortunes and to partake the indignation of the beaten Abolitionist. And to think that all this hypocrisy is attached as an exordium to a eulogy on the character of George Washington! The tongue that can utter a wail over the prostrate body of an infamous Abolitionist is not worthy to name the name of George Washington. Mr. Everett should accept the offer of the professional rhetorician, and henceforth have his polished periods declaimed by a substitute. He is unfit to speak in the name of the ladies of Virginia, and we trust the managers of the Mount Vernon enterprise will dispense with his services. Everett a mourner at Sumner's fictitious funeral! In the end the most pompous plausibilities will be stripped of their disguise, and exposed to the contempt and ridicule of the world.

From the same paper, June 9.

SUMNER SYMPATHIZERS.

It is idle to talk of union, or peace, or truce with Sumner or Sumner's friends. Catiline was purity itself compared to the Massachusetts Senator, and his friends are no better than he. They are all (we mean the leading and conspicuous ones) avowed and active traitors. The sending the Congressional Committee to Kansas was done with the treasonable purpose of aiding the rebellion in that Territory. The Black Republicans in Congress are at open war with government, and, like their allies, the Garrisonian Abolitionists, equally at war with religion, female virtue, private property, and distinction of race. They all deserve the halter, and it is vain and idle to indulge the expectation that there can be union or peace with such men. Sumner and Sumner's friends must be punished and silenced. Government, which cannot suppress such crimes as theirs, has failed of its purpose. Either such wretches must be hung or put in the penitentiary, or the South should prepare at once to quit the Union. We would not jeopard the religion and morality of the South to save a union that had failed for every useful purpose. Let us tell the North at once, "If you cannot suppress the treasonable action, and silence the foul, licentious and infidel propagandism, of such men as Stephen Pearl Andrews, Wendell Phillips, Beecher, Garrison, Sumner and their negro and female associates, let us part in peace. We would like to see modesty, female virtue, common morality and religion independent of government. The experiment at the South to leave these matters to the regulation of public opinion works admirably. We are the most moral, religious, contented and law-abiding people on earth, and are daily becoming more so.

The reverse of all this is, for the time, at least, true at the North. If you cannot expel the Black Republicans from power, punish them and silence them for the future, you are incapable of self-government. You should adopt a military despotism. We adhere to our republican institutions. Your sympathy for Sumner has shaken our confidence in your capacity for self-government more than all your past history, full of evil portents as that has been. He had just avowed his complicity in designs far more diabolical than those of Catiline or Cethegus, nay, transcending in iniquity all that the genius of a Milton had attributed to his fallen angels. We are not surprised that he should be hailed as hero and saint, for his proposed war on everything sacred and divine, by that Pandemonium where the blasphemous Garrison, and Parker, and Andrews, with their runaway negroes and masculine women, congregate. He belongs to that crew himself. He is a proper saint for a free-love saloon, or an infidel convention. But unless there be enough of patriotism, religion and morality at the North to express general detestation of his crimes and congratulations at his merited castigation, we had better part company. No evil that can befal the South would be so great as association with Sumner and Sumner's sympathizers.

From The Richmond Whig, June 4.

THE PROGRESS OF THE REVOLUTION.

We lay, this morning, before the people of Virginia and the South, the resolutions and speeches at a meeting in New York, said to be composed of the choice spirits of all parties. We desire that the Southern people should have the opportunity to see what sentiments are expressed with reference to them by their brethren of the North; that they may be the better able to judge of the advantages and probabilities of our continuing a united people.

The meeting purports to have for its object the maintenance of the freedom of speech. These gentlemen claim that members of Congress have the right, as members, to say anything they choose with impunity, about anybody or anything. There is no limitation whatever to the exercise of the privilege. A M. C. may villify and defame individuals *ad libitum*—it is his constitutional right. The aggrieved party has no redress. Submission is his only alternative. This is a very convenient doctrine for foul-mouthed dastards; but it is one which has no sanction in reason, in justice or the manly sense of resentment which animates the bosom of a high-spirited people. Dr. Franklin laid down the true doctrine on this subject many years ago. He said that the freedom of speech carried with it the freedom of the cudgel. The brave and honourable man, who, hedged about by privileges, insults an individual, will make reparation or give satisfaction according to the usages of gentlemen; but the blackguard, who does the same thing, being insensible to the dictates of honour, can only be reached by the cowhide or bludgeon.

But the truth is, there is no question about the freedom of speech in the matter. Mr. Brooks did not deny Mr. Sumner's right to charge his uncle with every possible falsehood; he only claimed the right to chastise him for the foul imputation. The affair was nothing more than one of the thousand of personal difficulties which are always taking place. The wise men, the great men of Gotham, however, affect to see in it an assault upon the very citadel of freedom. By their extravagance and obvious perversion and distortion of a plain matter, they betray the dishonesty of their motives. The wounds to the public law is all a pretence—their real purpose is to subserve the cause of political abortion.

These gentlemen—we are willing to concede that they are what they claim to be—the foremost characters in New York, set up to be arbiters of chivalry and true courage. By their discourses and conduct towards others, they furnished us with their idea of a man of honour and heroism. Three hundred miles from the scene of danger, and proclaiming to the world that they repudiate all personal responsibility for insults, they denounce Mr. Brooks as a coward, and stigmatize the whole population of the South as "ruffians," "assassins," "brutes," "murderers," "scoundrels," "cowards," &c., &c. We confess our inability to appreciate the valour of this proceeding. Wherein its daring manhood consists we are unable to perceive. In all our reading of brave men and heroic nations, we have never encountered any who did not seem to consider that a willingness to incur some degree of personal risk was essential to the attribute of courage, and if we were to subject the wordy heroes of New York to those tests, we should say they were destitute of the first principle of honour and the least particle of generous manhood. To speak of feeling an insult as a wound would be to them an unintelligible jargon. Not one of them ever experienced the sensation implied in the phrase. They are dead to its effects—they are unconscious of its existence. That they possess the gross, brute courage of barbarians, or that which cowards derive from superior numbers, we doubt not. A Mr. Ruggles, one of the fiery orators, supplies a lively illustration of the fact. "Let us all go to Washington," he exclaimed. The valiant man had no idea of going alone! Mr. Morgan, a M. C. from New York, also figured on the occasion. He took it upon himself to pronounce Mr. Brooks a *villain*. We do not know that Mr. Morgan is a dastard—and we shall not, therefore, denounce him as one. But, if, when he returns to Washington, Mr. Brooks shall demand a retraction of the insult, or satisfaction for it, and he shall refuse the one or the other, it would be impossible for us to resist the conviction that he was describing himself when speaking of Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Calhoun and many other sagacious and profound thinkers have contended that the Northern people were incapable of preserving free institutions. With a population far from dense, compared with Europe, a resort to the military is no unfrequent occurrence among them, even at the present time. Their breed of noble men is well-nigh extinct. All their really great men of the revolution were bred up under slave institutions; for at that time slavery existed in all the Colonies. Their greatest man of later days was Webster. He was destitute of moral courage, and his whole character was disfigured by ignoble stains.

Of the present generation—excepting Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Winthrop, neither of whom has mingled in this wordy foray against the South—their public men are mere demagogues—shallow pretenders—fit only for the stock-jobbing department of politics. Under the lead of canting hypocrites, they affect a mighty degree of piety, and their nice consciences are greatly distressed about the slaves, whom their piratical ancestors kidnapped and brought to this country, and sold to Southern planters. Probably, if the bottom of their hearts were searched, it would be found that they are chiefly anxious to liberate the present race of Africans, that they might have the opportunity of supplying their place, by resuming the old and profitable traffic by which they made so much money in former times. They, however, as represented by the *élite* of New York, claim to be the only fit people to uphold free government, and manage the affairs of a republic. The only evidence we have of their fitness is their late and continued attempt to subvert the legal government of Kansas by a mob of craven fanatics, who, after defying war, either sold or threw away their arms, and took to their heels; and their recent proposition, through the columns of the *Tribune*, to send a band of bullies to Washington to overawe Congress, which proposition was seconded and amended, by the furious Ruggles, to include all, and loudly applauded by the meeting of honourable and courageous gentlemen of New York. Union square, Fifth avenue and Wall street have, by recommending force, put a ball in motion which may cause their palaces to topple, and cannot be stopped as easily as it was started.

The funniest part of the imposing exhibition was the failure of the effort to conceal its real character by keeping the avowed Abolitionists muzzled and out of view. But old Beecher was on hand, and, to the horror of the pretended conservatives, appropriately closed the proceedings.

From The Richmond Examiner.

REPROOF FROM THE FIVE POINTS—HOT-CORN RESOLUTIONS.

The New York papers of Saturday last are filled with the proceedings of an immense mass meeting which was held at the Broadway Tabernacle, the evening before, to express the indignation of that modern Sodom over the "Sumner Outrage." The pawing, bellowing, throwing up of earth, lowing in chorus, and general kicking up of dust, which infuriated herds of cattle sometimes enact upon spots recently moistened by the blood of slaughtered bullocks or yearlings, are solemn, pathetic and moderate exhibitions of anger, compared with *the boisterous and extravagant proceedings of these indignant Bedlamites* at their Tabernacle on this distinguished occasion.

Who these great magnates are that have lent the influence of their names and the fervour of their eloquence to the meeting, we should have to consult *The City Directory* to learn. They certified each other, and seemed to be regarded by the meeting as the great lights and leaders of public sentiment in that city, which is enough to satisfy the judiciously incurious in metropolitan biography—too close an investigation of the careers of Wall street and Fifth avenue parvenues *being apt to lead explorers of delicate nostrils into paths and channels which they would gladly have avoided.*

Suffice it to say that George Griswold, who presided over the meeting, seems to have been an old man hauled out from retirement expressly to dignify the occasion by his gray hairs.

He was assisted by a long retinue of Vice-Presidents, among whom were men well known to the country.

Daniel Lord was the first speaker.

"Retiring amid applause," Lord was succeeded by a speaker still more bellicose, whose name was announced as Ruggles—Samuel A. Ruggles. Ruggles did not seem satisfied with speaking and resolving; Ruggles was for *marching off instanter* in the direction of Washington City and South Carolina to prevent Press Brooks from destroying the Government.

The meeting remained, nevertheless, to hear a speech from another orator—announced as Charles King—who turned out to be the President of Columbia College. Charles was not only some pumpkins as head of a college, but the meeting was informed that they beheld in the individual before them the son of Rufus King:

"He belonged to a race that had had something to do with the formation of the Constitution. And when he saw all its blessings stricken down by a dastardly coward, he could not refrain from expressing his sentiments on the subject."

Charles, the son of Rufus, having thus discharged the load of duty which had weighed upon his conscience and expressed himself freely and to his entire satisfaction, was followed by a man announced as Morgan, who had been an eye-witness of the "outrage" upon Sumner, and who came forward to rehearse the touching story to the meeting. Morgan had acted the Good Samaritan to the victim of Brooks, in the Senate Chamber, and concluded his narrative of the affair in the melting style of Mark Anthony.

We suppose the "slave States" will be able to bear all this villification with their usual complacency, and that they will take no extraordinary pains to induce the people of New York to "reconsider" their unfavourable judgment. They are veterans in the endurance of peltings like these. As to New York City, into whose lap they have poured the profits of their immense trade without stint for half a century, whose they have basked as their factor and steward and allowed to feed [illegible] whom they have enriched by their [illegible] patronage and made them to grow great from the produce of their lands and from the sweat of their brows; it is the old story of Jeshurun growing fat and kicking, *forsaking the benefactor that made him, and lightly esteeming the rock of his salvation:*

"Jeshurun! Jeshurun! thou art waxen fat; thou art growing thick; thou art covered with fatness."

But these proceedings are something more than the scoffings and railings of an ingrate. They were enacted in the haunts of vice and brutality which have been pictured in *The Tribune's Hot-Corn* revelations—in close vicinity to the theatre of the licentious orgies of the free-lovers. They were enacted *in one of those heterogeneous conclaves of merchants, mendicants, bankers, pick-pockets, millionaires, peterfunks, loafers-at-large, seducers, swindlers, snobs, model-artists, livery-men, divines, common-carriers, &c., with which every meeting in this modern Babylon is filled up to the brim, and "not a square inch to spare."*

One of her own highest authorities has declared, without contradiction, that there was more brutality, vice, knavery and prostitution, inclosed between Bleecker street and North and East Rivers than could be found in all the States of the Union South of Mason and Dixon's line. What the historian has said of ancient Babylon may be applied with truth to this modern w—e, though decency requires that it should [not] be repeated in his own language.

Selections.

SILENCE MUST BE NATIONALIZED.

LIBERTY of speech in a despotic government means the liberty of the despot to say what he pleases, and the liberty of everybody else to hold their tongues. This is the idea in the South now. They are willing that the North should say Amen, after their rhetoric. That is the whole liberty permitted. No man can, no man dare say one word in the South, in court, in legislature, in the field, in the church, or anywhere else—no man dare say one sharp, clear, effective word against slavery, or slave-policy. Anything may be said in its favour. No man's strength or name is enough to make it safe for him to make an issue with the tyrannic policy of the three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders of the South. If a clergyman should breath the slightest opinion that slavery is wrong, his place would be untenable. Should a professor in any college be suspected of association in any way with friends or doctrines of liberty, he is arraigned at once, and made either to recant in the most abject manner or to emigrate. Whatever men *think*, it is not safe for any man in the South to express, in the most guarded and frigid manner, anti-slavery sentiments. Nay, every day the lines are drawing. It is not permitted that men be neutral. They are obliged to take sides. They must come out and show their hands. And there is not in Paris, to-day, nor in Rome, nor in Vienna, a censorship more rigid, a police more ubiquitous and searching, to repress or punish free speech, than exists in Richmond or Charleston.

It could not be otherwise. A government of mere Power cannot allow Intelligence. Thinking and speaking are as fatal to despotism as summer sunshine is to frost and ice. Power demands silence. All predatory beasts are organized for stealth, for silence. The cat, the tiger, the lion, are all velvet-footed. They are not dangerous when they are noisy. They are most to be dreaded when they are most still.

On the plantation this doctrine is duty. The lash is the antithesis of the tongue. No matter how falsely charged, nor how cruelly wronged, the slave must not answer back. Civil society takes up the principle, and laws and courts will not listen to a slave in his own person. He has no tongue, no voice; he is civilly dumb. He is a creature, like all other human beings, endowed with reason, moral sentiments, affections, and passions. He yearns, he enjoys, he laughs and cries, he hopes or fears. But there is no civil liberty to give voice to one's feeling. The sorrows of slaves have brooded and silently gathered above their haunts and huts, until, to the ear of God, the whole space between heaven and earth is as a vast aerial and cloud-built organ, piped and voiced with sorrows; and no man is found that dare press the keys and utter that august symphony of suppressed grief which, if it should be sounded, would fill the world with amazement, as if the woes of the damned had taken wing, and were flying in the air over the continent!

The whole South is smothered. The slave is dumb. The free coloured man is dumb. The poor white man is dumb. The merchant and lawyer are dumb. The minister is dumb, and the politician dumb. Dumb, we mean, for truth, for liberty, for anything except the defence of slavery.

But, Northern habits are extremely vexatious to this state of things. Washington is in the midst of slavery. Western and Northern men bring to Congress their free tongues. They annoy and vex the submissive silence of the South. For a long time, there prevailed a tacit understanding that there should be nothing said in Congress. Courtesy, and that most seeming and urbane of all demons, Compromise, enjoined silence—unless, of course, some Northern scholar, ambitious of preferment, asked leave to take his musket and fight for slavery in Southern ranks.

As long ago as 1836, under the famous agitation about Petition, the South took imperious attitudes, and squarely denied the right of the North to say one word about that part of our national policy which is the most vital, viz., real liberty. Freedom of speech was resolutely denied, and it was declared that it must be put down.

If fifteen States should resolve that the sun should not shine, and the clouds should not drop any more rain, their success would be fully as great as has been the endeavour to *nationalize silence!*

The more it was suppressed, the more discussion grew. Mobs, caucuses, conventions, parties, platforms, great men, and the government itself, have all tried to put down free speech, which yet walks the earth, or flies the air free as winds, and as mighty too, when it shall, ere long, gather its forces, and come as the breath of the Lord, and the voice of a People.

In 1850, however, the question was settled by dodging, as all questions of *principle* in American politics have been settled for the last thirty years. The most vicious element that ever entered American affairs was the once so much admired policy of COMPROMISE. Compromise is nothing but a method of dodging a real principle, instead of settling it by fair and full discussion and action. It leads to a habit of shuffling cowardice. It destroys that open, honest, manly spirit that grapples with difficulties in a fair conflict; and breeds instead a miserable, mousing, intriguing, manœuvering policy, of seeming to do what you do not; of using words to hide things. Compromise is the beautiful illicit mother of infinite lies, hypocrisies, and sleek cowardices!

In 1850, the South demanded, and men agreed, that there should be SILENCE, that it should be *national!* But God thundered in the heavens, and the earth was full of the echoes of his voice. Thrice ten thousand men refused to be silent, though almost every leading man, North and South, had agreed that discussion should be put down.

In 1855 and 1856, the South pushed their scheme Westward. That gigantic conspiracy was developed of which Kansas is but a single finger, but whose whole hand is yet to gripe the throat of the Nation. Under cover of compromise and peace, they violated compact, compromise, and national peace. They broke over the line made sacred by a Nation's word. They crept to the cradle of a young State, as the mythical serpents glided to the cradle of Hercules, to strangle him before his strength came upon him.

Their first stroke was to *silence* men. A Legislature was made up of all destructive materials, and thrown over from Missouri, as engineers throw bombs from huge-mouthed mortars, and it was its supreme errand to silence discussion. The imported Legislature of Kansas makes free speech and a free press penitentiary offences. The Government of these United States endorsed the Deed. Let men consider! The President of these United States and the Government of this Republic are deliberately committed to a long-formed, deeply-laid plan of destroying free speech in this Republic, and making SILENCE NATIONAL!

At this point, some few men, in the good providence of God, stood in the United States Senate, whose hearts were not sepulchres, and whose tongues were not like dead men lying in them. Seward, Wade, Chase, Trumbull, Wilson, and Sumner, spoke, and in substance and manner that became men standing in the temple of Liberty, and in the home of Liberty, demanding that freedom should be the seed and fruit of free institutions. Of this heroic band there was one whose gentle nature, whose retiring habits and scholarly fastidiousness made it safer to attack than another. It happened, too, that he was second to none in the freedom of his speech. His tongue moved to the impulses of a heart as true to Liberty as the heart of Washington. But it was not safe to assault him as he walked to and fro in the street. The South needed a man who dared to strike from behind—who had the coward's knack—the real assassin's trick. Plantations are schools that turn out enough of such soldiers of infamy. One was found. He set himself in watch. Not when he left his hotel, not when he walked the street, not when his feet were free, nor his hands free, would he venture. But, at length, espying him with his feet in stocks, his head bent low to his manuscript, his hands busy with his pen, he struck him down—helpless, unarmed, unwarned—and then, as a butcher repeats his blows upon a bullock, he beat the prostrate and helpless Senator!

This deed stands absolutely alone in our history. It has not a single fellow! There have been brutal things, and cruel things, and mean things, and cowardly things, and wicked and inhuman wrongs, but nothing before that epitomised them all. With the exception of one or two presses, the whole South has accepted the act, and made it representative! It is no longer Brooks that struck Sumner! He was the arm, but the whole South was the body! And with one consent it is declared that for the crime of *free speech* it was done and deserved!

As a forest roars when a tornado sweeps it, so the North was swayed. As prairies flash when autumnal fires rage, so the public feeling hummed and glowed. Villages, towns and cities spake with an indignation and with a unanimity never before known in the North! The tidings of these meetings, the resolutions that were like ranks of serried spears in the day of battle, the record of the speeches, were borne Southward. We are beginning to hear their judgment. * * * *

Is Bunker Hill to become the footstool of slavery? Are all the records and trophies of our early days of Liberty to serve only to grace the car of Oppression? Are the men to whom such ideas are inbred, and such language is vernacular, who laugh at the pen and swear by the bludgeon, who pronounce assassination a virtue, and quarter upon their coats of arms the insignia of brutal violence, are these the men to whom the North can afford to submit and bow down?

When that day shall come, some Southern sculptor will engrave upon the shaft of Bunker Hill the symbol of a whip. And old Faneuil Hall shall have above its platform a plucked-out tongue—as on funeral monuments men carve torches reversed, to signify that their function is ended.—*H. W. Beecher, in The Independent.*

SLAVERY IN THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

[The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held its quadrennial session at Indianapolis, Ia., commencing May 1st and closing June 2d, 1856. The subject of slavery occupied a large share of the time. It was first introduced by the Bishops, in their official address to the Conference, as follows:]

VIEWS OF THE BISHOPS.

"In compliance with the request of the Troy, Erie, North Ohio and Wisconsin Conferences, different resolutions, asking a change in the General Rule on slavery, were laid before all the Annual Conferences for their concurrence. The result will be found by inspection of the journals, but, we believe, no one of these resolutions received the constitutional majority of the members of the Annual Conferences. In view of this fact, the question may arise whether this body has authority to change the Discipline upon this subject so as to affect membership in the Church. We are aware that it is difficult to separate the consideration of the desirableness of any measure from its constitutionality, and especially so where deep feeling on the subject may exist. Yet we think it to be our duty to express our strong doubts whether, in view of the restricted powers of a delegated General Conference, any measure equivalent to a change in the General Rules can be constitutionally adopted without the concurrence of the Annual Conferences. As to the propriety of any modifications not of such a character as to conflict with the constitutional economy of the Church, while opinions and views may be various, we can fully confide in the wisdom of this General Conference as the supreme council of the Church.

In our administration in the territory where slavery exists, we have been careful not to transcend in any instance, or in any respect, what we understood to be the will and direction of the General Conference. That body having retained its jurisdiction over Conferences previously existing in such territory, and having directed the organization of additional Conferences, it became our duty to arrange the districts, circuits and stations, and to superintend them as an integral part of the Church. As the result, we have six Annual Conferences which are wholly or in part in slave territory. These Conferences have a white Church-membership, including probationers, of more than 143,000, with the attendants upon our ministry, making a probable population of between five and six hundred thousand. They have a coloured Church-membership, including probationers, of more than 8,000, with the attendants upon our ministry, making a probable population of upward of a hundred thousand. A portion of this population are slaves. The others are mostly poor. They are generally strongly attached to the Church of their choice, and look to it confidingly for ministerial services, religious sympathy, and all the offices of Christian kindness. The white membership in these Conferences, in respect to intelligence, piety and attachment to Methodist Discipline and economy, will compare favorably with other portions of the Church.

In our judgment, the existence of these Conferences and Churches, under their present circumstances, does not tend to extend or perpetuate slavery. They are known to be organized under a Discipline which characterizes slavery as a great evil; which makes the slaveholder ineligible to any official station in the Church, where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom; which disfranchises a travelling minister who, by any means, becomes the owner of a slave or slaves, unless he executes, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves conformably to the laws of the State wherein he lives; which makes it the duty of all the ministers to enforce upon all the members the necessity of teaching their slaves to read the word of God, and allowing them time to attend upon the public worship of God on our regular days of Divine service; which prohibits the buying and selling of men, women and children with an intention to enslave them, and inquires what shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery.

With this Discipline freely circulated among the people, or certainly within the reach of any who desire to examine it, and with other Churches existing in the same territory without these exactments, these societies and Conferences have, either by elective affinity adhered to, or from preferences associated with, the Methodist Episcopal Church. In a few instances their Church relations have exposed them to some peril, and in numerous cases to sacrifices. But such have been their moral worth, and Christian excellence, and prudent conduct, that generally they have been permitted to enjoy their religious immunities, and serve and worship God according to their consciences.

[Subsequently the whole subject was referred to a Committee of one from each Annual Conference—38 in all—Mr. Raymond, of New Hampshire, being Chairman. From this Committee there were two reports, which will be found below; the first presented May 21st, the last on the following day.]

MAJORITY REPORT.

The Committe on Slavery present the following as their Report:

That the reduction of a moral and responsible being to the condition of property is a violation of natural rights, is considered by most men an axiom in ethics; but whatever opinions may have obtained in general society, the Methodist Episcopal Church has ever maintained an unmistakeable anti-slavery position. Affirmations that slavery is founded in the philosophy of civil society, that it "is the corner-stone of republican institutions," or that it "is sanctioned by the Bible," have never met with an approving response in our Church. Contrariwise, the founder of Methodism denounced the system in unqualified terms of condemnation, and the fathers unwaveringly followed the example of the venerated Wesley.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has, in good faith, in all the periods of its history, proposed to itself the question, "What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?" and it has never ceased, openly and before the world, to bear its testimony against the sin, and to exercise its disciplinary powers to the end that its members might be kept unspotted from criminal connection with the system, and that the evil itself be removed from among men.

It is affirmed and believed that the Methodist Episcopal Church has done more to diffuse anti-slavery sentiments, to mitigate the evils of the system, and to abolish the institution from civil society, than any other organization, either political, social or religious. It is also affirmed, and believed, that the administrators of discipline in our Church, within the bounds of slave territory, have faithfully done all that, under their circumstances, they have conscientiously judged to be in their power, *to answer the ends of the Discipline in extenuating that great evil.*

At this period in our history we are met with the inquiry, Does our book of Discipline state clearly and definitely our true position and our real sentiments? Does the letter of the statute distinctly indicate the practice we oppose? We answer, *No*, and give, from among others, the following reasons for our negative reply. The Discipline does not, in express terms, make the slaveholder ineligible to the episcopacy, and yet the General Conference of '44 considered itself justified, both by the spirit of the Discipline and the acknowledged practice of the Church, in affirming that the relation of slaveholder was a disqualification for the office of a bishop, and this it did at the expense of an ever-to-be-regretted division of our ecclesiastical organization. The Discipline declares that "when any travelling preacher becomes the owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slave conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives"; but the administration, assuming that legal emancipation in the case of travelling preachers is universally practicable, does not admit a slaveholder to the itinerant connection.

Again, our Discipline does not distinguish between mercenary slaveholding and the holding of a slave for benevolent purposes, and yet all the arguments found in our official publications, or heard in our Conference debates, by which the admission of slaveholders to Church membership is justified, are based upon this distinction, and that for the obvious reason that the distinction itself does really and justly exist in the public mind, and the practice referred to cannot otherwise be justified. Our book of Discipline does not expressly enjoin it upon our members that they secure to their slaves the sanctity of the conjugal and parental relations, and yet, within all the borders of our slaveholding territory, the uttered suspicion that Methodists are negligent in these regards would be repelled with indignation.

We now inquire whether the time has come when it becomes the duty of the Church, through its representatives assembled in its highest ecclesiastical court, so to revise the statutes of the Church as to make them express our real sentiments, and indicate our practice as it is? We answer, Yes: First, because it is just and equal; it is right before God and all men that, on a subject involving directly the personal liberties of thousands, and indirectly of millions, of our fellow-men, the position of the Church should be neither equivocal nor doubtful. Secondly, because we cannot answer it to our own consciences, nor to God, the Judge of all, if we fail to do what is in our power to bear testimony against so great an evil. Thirdly, because it is solemnly demanded at our hands by a very large majority of those whom we represent; and, fourthly, because the signs of the times plainly indicate that it is the duty of all good men to rally for the relief of the oppressed, and for the defence of the liberties transmitted to us by our fathers.

We are aware that it is objected that, in the present excited state of the public mind, to take any action on the subject will be to place a weapon in the hands of our enemies, with which they may do us essential injury. We reply that, in all cases, to say one thing and mean another is of doubtful *expediency*, as well as of doubtful morality. We judge the rather that, on all questions vital to morality and religion, the honour of the Church is better sustained by an unqualified declaration of the truth.

We come now to state what, as it seems to us, is, always has been, and ever should be, the true position of our Church in respect to slavery. We hold that the buying, selling, and, by inference, the holding of a human being as property is a sin against God and man; that, because of the social relations in which men may be placed by the civil codes of slaveholding communities, the legal relation of master and slave may, in some circumstances, subsist innocently; that connection with slavery is *prima facie* evidence of guilt; that in all cases of alleged criminality of this kind, the burden of proof should rest upon the accused, he always having secured to him the advantages of trial and appeal before impartial tribunals. In view of these facts and principles, the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1st, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That we recommend the several Annual Conferences so to amend our General Rule on Slavery as to read—The buying, selling, or holding a human being as property.

Resolved, 2d, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That the following be and hereby is substituted in the place of the present seventh chapter of our book of Discipline, to wit:

What shall be done for the Extirpation of the Evil of Slavery? Ans. 1. We declare we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery. We believe that all men, by nature, have an equal right to freedom, and that no man has a moral right to hold a fellow-being as property. Therefore, no slaveholder shall be eligible to membership in our Church hereafter, where emancipation can be effected without injury to the slave; but, inasmuch as persons may be brought into the legal relation of slaveholders, involuntarily or voluntarily, by purchasing slaves in order to free them, therefore the merely legal relation shall not be considered, of itself, sufficient to exclude a person who may thus sustain it from the fellowship of the Church.

Ans. 2. Whenever a member of our Church, by any means, becomes the owner of a slave, it shall be the duty of the preacher in charge to call together a committee of at least three members, who shall investigate the case, and determine the time in which such slaves shall be free; and on his refusal or neglect to abide by the decision of said committee, he shall be dealt with as in case of immorality.

Ans. 3. It shall be the duty of all our members and probationers, who may sustain the legal relation of slaveholder, to teach their servants to read the word of God; to allow them to attend the public worship of God, on our regular days of Divine service; to protect them in the observance of the duties of the conjugal and parental relations; to give them such compensation for their services as may, under the circumstances, be just and equal; to make such provisions as may be legally practicable to prevent them and their posterity from passing into perpetual slavery, and to treat them in all respects as required by the law of love.

Ans. 4. It shall be the duty of our preachers prudently to enforce the above rules.

MINORITY REPORT.

J. A. COLLINS presented the following Report from the minority of the Committee on Slavery:

The undersigned, constituting the minority of the Committee on Slavery, not being able to agree with the majority in the conclusions to which they have come contained in their Report to the General Conference, beg leave respectfully to submit the reasons for their dissent as follows:

1. The chapter proposed by the majority in lieu of the one now in the Discipline on slavery is manifestly in conflict with the Constitution of our Church. In the first answer to the question, "What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?" it is provided that "no slaveholder shall be eligible to membership in our Church hereafter, where emancipation can be effected without injury to the slave"; which creates a condition of membership unknown to the Discipline, and which cannot be enacted under the General Rule as it now stands in relation to slavery. This feature is intended to bear upon applicants for admission into our societies. The second answer reaches members now in our Church who, "by any means," may become the owners of slaves, and also those who are at present slaveholders, if they should come into the possession of more. In either of these cases, the party is to be brought before a committee to "determine the time in which" the slaves "shall be freed;" and in the event of "refusal" or "neglect" to comply with the decision of the committee, he is to be "dealt with as in case of immorality," thus clearly making emancipation, and, in effect, non-slaveholding, a term of communion or Church-fellowship with us. Before this provision can be engrafted upon the Discipline constitutionally, the General Rule with respect to slavery must be essentially altered, which can only be done by compliance with the proviso to the sixth restriction, which says: "Provided, nevertheless, that upon the concurrent recommendation of three-fourths of all the members of the several Annual Conferences, who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, then a majority of two-thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice to alter any of the above restrictions, excepting the first article; and also, whenever such alteration or alterations shall have been first recommended by two-thirds of the General Conference, so soon as three-fourths of the members of all the annual conferences shall have concurred as aforesaid, such alteration or alterations shall take effect." It is not proposed in the Report of the majority of the committee to submit their action to the operation of this constitutional method, but to carry it by a mere majority of this General Conference, leaving the General Rule as it is, which, if successful, and the proposed chapter be placed in the Discipline, will be a palpable violation of the Constitution.

2. Because our Discipline, as we understand it, is probably now as strongly opposed to slavery as the state and circumstances of the case will allow.

3. Because we are clearly understood to be and are accepted and treated as a Church opposed to slavery, yet having due regard to the authority of the State.

4. Because our practice under the Discipline is faithful, and fruitful of good, restraining the traffic, and working the cheerful and voluntary emancipation of slaves.

5. Because we are deeply convinced that any increased stringency of the Discipline on the subject of slavery will greatly weaken, if not destroy, our Church in the slave-holding States, and along the border.

6. Because this reduction

of the Discipline is true. The administration also has been always and everywhere right. There is nothing wrong, save and except the mere wording of the discipline! All that is necessary is to so revise the statutes of the Church as to make them express our real sentiments and indicate our practice as it is." Such are its plain, unequivocal statements. I will now point out the utter inconsistency of this Report with the facts. It contains, indeed, eight false statements.

1. "The Methodist Episcopal Church has, in good faith, in all periods of its history, proposed to itself the question, What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?"

2. "It has never ceased, openly and before the world, to bear its testimony against the sin."

3. "And to exercise its disciplinary powers to the end that its members might be kept unspotted from criminal connection with the system."

4. "And that the evil might be removed from among men."

5. "The Methodist Episcopal Church have done more to diffuse anti-slavery sentiments, to mitigate the evils of the system, and to abolish the institution, than any other organization, political, social or religious."

6. "The true position of our Church always has been, that the buying and selling, and, by inference, the holding, of a human being as property is a sin against God and man."

7. "That connection with slavery is *prima facie* evidence of guilt."

8. "That in all cases of immorality of this kind, the burden of proof should rest upon the accused."

These statements are now briefly offset with contradictions, the evidence in support of which we will give in detail if any one denies.

1. The *lack* of "good faith" is manifest in the fact that, from the earliest period of its history, that Church has pursued in its legislation a continual series of changes; each succeeding one being less stringent than the other, until, in the process of developing a bad faith, the dilution and change for the worse has embodied itself in the present chapter on slavery, which is an acknowledged burlesque on common sense. And its utter unfitness is declared by the fact that this committee wish to displace it wholly by inserting a new chapter.

2. There is not any testimony upon record for forty-eight years past, in the language of the Church, declaring slavery a sin"—*not one word!*

3. Dr. Emory, in his history of the Discipline, published by the Methodist Episcopal Church, says, on page 278—"All that related to slaveholding among private members was struck out in 1808." That is now forty-eight years ago.

4. The General Conference of 1836 said, "We wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave as it exists in the slaveholding States of the Union."

5. That Church has retreated, step by step, for half a century—relaxing its discipline, muzzling its ministry, suppressing discussion and proscribing, as no "other organization, political, social or religious," ever dared to do!

6. No such declaration was ever made by the Church. And the allowing of her membership, without let or hindrance, to do all this for forty-eight years shows the position of the Church to be directly the opposite.

7. So far from this being true, the General Conference of 1840 even said that "The simple holding of slaves * * * constitutes no legal barrier to the election or ordination of MINISTERS to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church."

8. There is not even the suspicion of wrong-doing attached to slaveholding since 1808, when all prohibition thereof among private members was struck out of the Discipline. And no provision is made for accusation or proof, for the very sufficient reason that it is no offence against the Discipline as it is, and as it has been for nearly fifty years.

The Report is a failure. It fails to meet the necessity of the case. It fails to state the facts of the past. It will fail to pass. My desire to see the efforts to defeat it fail was expressed before I heard the numerous falsifications of fact that its preamble contains. I now think it deserves to fail. To pass it would be to endorse the pro-slavery statements of twenty years past. Nor am I surprised that Dr. Bowen repudiated the thing in committee, and left for home.

But in order to avoid the offence that a plain, unequivocal statement might give—to secure the promise of a plausible sophistry, by which their conclusion would have the semblance of a logical deduction—men who know better consented to the presentation of the thing. Already has its weakness become transparent. The opposite party see it, and are prepared in their Minority Report to take advantage of it.

The adoptation of the thing as a remedy for slaveholding, and as a rebuke of the system of slavery, will be judged of by the following fact.

During the reading of the Majority Report, a Kentuckian was observed listening with deep interest, in common with others. When it concluded, he turned to one next him: "There, sir, that's a Report for you. There is some sense in that, now, I tell you! But to-morrow, when the ——— Abolitionists bring in their Report, you'll see a fracas!"

[The editor of the *Religious Telescope* (the organ, we believe, of the "United Brethren in Christ"), writing from the Conference, thus expresses his opinion as to the influences that operated to control its action.]

We have now listened to the debate one day, and are fully satisfied that even the feeble, milk-and-water report of the majority cannot pass. True, an overwhelming majority of the delegates present were sent to do as much at least as the Majority Report proposes; but since they have reached this place, various influences have reduced that overwhelming majority to a bare majority, if not to a minority. Let us enumerate some of those influences:

1st. The bold threats of old Baltimore and the border generally to secede if *anything* should be done; and the intimations of Philadelphia and a string of the middle Conferences to go along. This took the backbone out of those anti-slavery delegates who place Methodism first and humanity second.

2d. The Episcopal address, the whole weight of which went dead against the friends of reform. Some anti-slavery delegates, wishing, perhaps, to obtain or retain the Presiding Eldership, or good city stations, and finding the Bishops, who have these gifts in their hands, all on the pro-slavery side, concluded, doubtless, that prudence was the better part of valour. True, they might be frowned upon by their brethren at home, but what of that when the appointing power was on their side? The Episcopal address took the buckram out of those anti-slavery men who place *interest* above *duty*.

3d. *Hope of office.* I could point my finger to some men in this body, that were expected to be leaders in the reform, that have lately become "Union-savers," out of hope for an agency, editorship, etc. In a few days, about twenty lucrative and honourable offices are to be filled, and the border men have declared that they will vote for *no new-ruleist*. But they know how to approach a leading new-ruleist, and propose to him a fat office, providing he will waive his anti-slavery notions and become a good Methodist. You can see the hope of office *sticking out of* several who were expected to go for a new chapter.

We are now satisfied that while slavery is maintained by the civil government, the Methodist Episcopal Church will maintain it, in all its forms, in her communion.

[J. Floy, one of the delegates from New York, introduced the following report, from the Committee on the Tract Cause, and, after an earnest discussion, it was adopted.]

The Tract Committee, having had under consideration the publication of anti-slavery literature, recommend for adoption the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Book Agents and Tract Secretary be, and they hereby are, instructed to publish, in tract or book form, such anti-slavery matter as the subject of slavery may demand, including Mr. Wesley's Thoughts on Slavery.

PACIFIC INCLINATIONS.

THE Washington correspondent of the New York *Observer* is especially delighted with the Democratic nomination for Vice-President. He thus speaks of Mr. Breckinridge:

WASHINGTON, Monday, June 9, 1856.

But in their candidate for the Vice-Presidency, the Democrats have indeed been eminently fortunate—far more so than if they had taken General Quitman, a lucky soldier and a filibuster. Here again the civil has prevailed against the military, and they have a fine young man in John C. Breckinridge, whom *they will do well to elect*. From personal acquaintance with him, I can truly say he is an admirable youth (for he can scarcely have passed 35 years, and looks youthful), of *good moral habits and principles, religiously connected and pacifically inclined*.

It is worth while to understand what an old religious newspaper like the *Observer* considers "good moral habits and principles," and what it is to be "religiously connected and pacifically inclined," in the view of such a journal. As the only evidence of Mr. Breckinridge's sentiments upon this subject which is at this moment accessible to us, therefore, we reprint the following correspondence, to which Mr. B. was a party about two years since:

Mr. Cutting to Mr. Breckinridge.

WASHINGTON, March 27, 1854.

HON. J. C. BRECKINRIDGE—*Sir:* In the course of the debate in the House this morning, in reply to what I considered to be a legitimate criticism upon your argument, you asserted that what I said was false. I now call upon you to retract this assertion, or to make the explanation due from one gentleman to another. This will be handed to you by my friend, Mr. Maurice, who is authorized to receive your answer, and to act for me.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant, F. B. CUTTING.

Mr. Breckinridge to Mr. Cutting.

WASHINGTON CITY, March 28, 1854.

HON. F. B. CUTTING—*Sir:* Having received your note last night at a very late hour, I had no time to consult a friend to whom I would refer the Hon. Mr. Maurice, to embrace the alternative offered by your note, and arrange the terms of our meeting, until this morning. My friend Col. Hawkins will present this note, and act for me in the matter. I have the honour to remain your obt. serv't,

JOHN C. BRECKINRIDGE.

Mr. Cutting to Mr. Breckinridge.

WASHINGTON, March 28, 1854.

HON. J. C. BRECKINRIDGE—*Sir:* I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of this morning, in which you refer me to your friend Col. Hawkins, to arrange the terms of our meeting. My friend Col. Monroe, whom I have chosen for that purpose, will confer with Col. Hawkins on the subject.

I have the honour to remain your obedient servant,

F. B. CUTTING.

Col. Hawkins to Col. Monroe.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, March 29, 1854.

COL. JAMES MONROE—*Sir:* Below I submit the terms regulating the meeting between Hon. F. B. Cutting and Hon. J. C. Breckinridge:

The time of meeting shall be this afternoon, between the hours of 3 and 4 o'clock.

The place of meeting shall be at or near the residence of Mr. F. P. Blair, in the State of Maryland and about six or seven miles from the City of Washington.

The weapon shall be *the ordinary rifle, commonly known as the Western rifle*, which shall be charged with one charge of powder and one round ball.

The distance shall be sixty paces.

The parties shall stand erect, with their feet not more than twelve inches apart.

The weapons shall be placed in the hands of the principals by their respective seconds, cocked, with the butt to the shoulder, the muzzle pointing to the ground, not more than three feet from the left toe.

The word shall be given in the following manner: "Gentlemen, are you ready? Fire—one—two—three"—with a pause of at least a second between the words. Neither party shall be at liberty to raise his piece before the word "three." If the parties are ready, no response shall be given; if not ready, he will respond promptly, "Not ready."

Before the parties are armed, the word shall be given in blank by the second who has won it, in as nearly the same manner as it will be given when they are to fire.

The choice of position and the giving of the word shall be determined by lot—the parties holding the same position so long as the fight may continue. But previous to each fire, the seconds shall again cast lots for the word.

Respectfully, your obedient servant, T. T. HAWKINS.

Our purpose in reprinting these letters is simply to arrive at some definite notion of the *Observer's* standard of "pacific inclination." It seems, then, that engaging in a duel and prescribing Kentucky rifles at sixty paces comes up to the *Observer's* mark. The fact is noteworthy mainly as an evidence of the extraordinary change which has been produced on the public mind, in regard to *fighting*, by the events of the past year or two. Two years ago, no *secular* paper would have felt justified in pronouncing Mr. Breckinridge to be "pacifically inclined" upon such evidence as that we have given above. But now it seems to satisfy the leading organ of the Old School Presbyterian Church upon that point. We presume this is due in some degree to the outrage perpetrated by Brooks upon Senator Sumner; for we notice that since this outrage the *Observer* has been much more belligerent than ever before.—*Times.*

SENATOR HAMLIN'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

Speech delivered in the United States Senate, Thursday, June 12.

MR. HAMLIN—Mr. President, I rise for a purpose purely personal, such as I have never before risen for in the Senate. I desire to explain some matters personal to myself and to my own future course in public life.

SEVERAL SENATORS—Go on.

MR. HAMLIN—I ask the Senate to excuse me from further service as Chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I do so because I feel that my relations hereafter will be of such a character as to render it proper that I should no longer hold that position. I owe this act to the dominant majority in the Senate. When I cease to harmonize with the majority, or tests are applied by that party with which I have acted to which I cannot submit, I feel that I ought no longer to hold that responsible position. I propose to state briefly the reasons which have brought me to that conclusion.

During nine years of service in the Senate, I have preferred rather to be a working than a talking member, and so I have been almost a silent one. On the subjects which have so much agitated the country, Senators know that I have rarely uttered a word. I love my country more than I love my party. I love my country above my love for any interests that can too deeply agitate or disturb its harmony. I saw in all the exciting scenes and debates through which we have passed no particular good that would result from my active intermingling in them. My heart has often been full, and the impulses of that heart have often been felt upon my lips; but I have repressed them there.

Sir, I hold that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was a gross moral and political wrong, unequalled in the annals of the legislation of this country, and hardly equalled in the annals of any other free country. Still, sir, with a desire to promote harmony and concord and brotherly feeling, I was a quiet man under all the exciting debates which led to that fatal result. I believed it wrong then; I can see that wrong lying broadcast all around us now. As a wrong I opposed that measure; not, indeed, by my voice, but with consistent and steady and uniform votes. I so resisted it in obedience to the dictates of my own judgment. I did it also cheerfully, in compliance with the instructions of the Legislature of Maine, which were passed by a vote almost unanimous. In the House of Representatives of Maine, consisting of one hundred and fifty-one members, only six, I think, dissented; and in the Senate, consisting of thirty-one members, only one member non-concurred.

But the Missouri restriction was abrogated. The portentous evils that were predicted have followed and are yet following along in its train. It was done, sir, in violation of the pledges of that party with which I have always acted and with which I have always voted. It was done in violation of solemn pledges of the President of the United States, made in his inaugural address. Still, sir, I was disposed to suffer the wrong until I should see that no evil results were flowing from it. We were told by almost every Senator who addressed us upon that occasion that no evil results would follow; that no practical difference in the settlement of the country and the character of the future States would take place, whether the act were done or not. I have waited calmly and patiently to see the fulfilment of that prediction; and I am grieved, sir, to say now that they have at least been mistaken in their predictions and promises. They have all signally failed.

That Senators might have voted for that measure under the belief then expressed, and the predictions to which I have alluded, I can well understand. But how Senators can now defend that measure amid all its evils, which are overwhelming the land, if not threatening it with a conflagration, is what I do not comprehend. The whole of the disturbed state of the country has its rise in and is attributable to that act alone—nothing else. It lies at the foundation of all our misfortunes and commotions. Had it not been done, that repose and quiet which prevaded the public mind then would hold it in tranquility to-day. Instead of startling events we should have quiet and peace within our borders, and that fraternal feeling which ought to animate the citizens of every part of the Union towards those of all other sections.

Sir, the events that are taking place around us are indeed startling. They challenge the public mind and appeal to the public judgment: they thrill the public nerve as electricity imparts a tremulous motion to the telegraphic wire. It is a period when all good men should unite in applying the proper remedy to secure peace and harmony to the country. Is this to be done by any of us by remaining associated with those who have been instrumental in producing these results and who now justify them? I do not see my duty lying in that direction.

I have, while temporarily acquiescing, stated here and at home, everywhere, uniformly, that when the tests of those measures were applied to me as one of party fidelity, I would sunder them as flax is sundered at the touch of fire. I do it now.

The occasion involves a question of moral duty; and self-respect allows me no other line of duty but to follow the dictates of my own judgment and the impulses of my own heart. A just man may cheerfully submit to many enforced humiliations, but a self-degraded man has ceased to be worthy to be deemed a man at all.

Sir, what has the recent Democratic Convention at Cincinnati done? *It has endorsed the measure I have condemned, and has sanctioned its destructive and ruinous effects.* It has done more, vastly more. That principle or policy of Territorial sovereignty which once had, and which I suppose now has, its advocates within these walls, is stricken down; and there is an absolute denial of it in the resolution of the Convention, if I can draw right conclusions—*a denial equally to Congress, and even to the people of the Territories, of the right to settle the question of slavery therein.* On the contrary, the Convention has actually incorporated into the platform of the Democratic party that doctrine which, only a few years ago, met nothing but ridicule and contempt, here and elsewhere, namely, that *the flag of the Federal Union, under the Constitution of the United States, carries slavery wherever it floats.* If this baleful principle be true, then that national ode which inspires us always, as on a battle field, should be re-written by Drake, and should read thus:

"Forever float that standard sheet,
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With SLAVERY'S soil beneath our feet,
And SLAVERY'S banner streaming o'er us."

Now, sir, what is the precise condition in which this matter is left by the Cincinnati Convention? I do not design to trespass many moments on the Senate; but allow me to read and offer a very few comments upon some portions of the Democratic platform. The first resolution that treats upon the subject is in these words—I read so much of it as is applicable to my present remarks:

"That Congress has no power under the Constitution to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that all such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs not prohibited by the Constitution."

I take it that this language thus far is language which meets a willing and ready response from every Senator here; certainly it does from me. But in the following resolution I find these words:

"Resolved, That the foregoing proposition covers, and was intended to embrace, the whole subject of slavery agitation in Congress."

The first resolution which I read was adopted years ago in Democratic Conventions. The second resolution which I read was adopted in subsequent years, when a different state of things had arisen, and it became necessary to apply an abstract proposition relating to the States to the Territories. Hence the adoption of the language contained in the second resolution which I have read.

Now, sir, I deny the position thus assumed by the Cincinnati Convention. In the language of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), so ably and so appropriately used on Tuesday last, I hold that *the entire and unqualified sovereignty of the Territories is in Congress.* That is my judgment; but this resolution brings the Territories precisely within the same limitations which are applied to the States in the resolution which I first read. The two taken together deny to Congress any power of legislation in the Territories.

Follow on and let us see what remains. Adopted as a part of the present platform, and as necessary to a new state of things, and to meet an emergency now existing, the Convention says:

"The American Democracy recognise and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the slavery question, upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—non-interference by Congress with slavery in States and Territories."

Then follows the last resolution:

"Resolved, That we recognise the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the fairly expressed will of the majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

Take all these resolutions together, and the deduction which we must necessarily draw from them is a denial to Congress of any power whatever to legislate upon the subject of slavery. The last resolution denies to the people of the Territory any power over that subject save when they shall have a sufficient number to form a Constitution and become a State, and also denies that Congress has any power over the subject; and so the resolutions hold that this power is at least in abeyance while the Territory is in a territorial condition. That is the only conclusion which you can draw from these resolutions. Alas! for short-lived territorial sovereignty! It came to its death in the house of its friends; it was buried by the same hands which had given it baptism!

But, sir, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing these resolutions, but only to read them, and state the action which I propose to take in view of them. I may, I probably shall, take some subsequent occasion, when I shall endeavour to present to the Senate and the country a fair account of what is the true issue presented to the people for their consideration.

My object now is to show only that the Cincinnati Convention has indorsed and approved of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, from which so many evils have already flowed, from which, I fear, more and worse evils must yet be anticipated. It would, of course, be expected that the Presidential nominee of that Convention would accept, cordially and cheerfully, the platform prepared for him by his party friends. No person can object to that. As there is no equivocation on his part about the matter, I beg leave to read a short extract from a speech of that gentleman, made at his own home within the last few days.

In reply to the Keystone Club, which paid him a visit there, Mr. Buchanan said:

"Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made you a longer speech, but now I have been placed on a platform of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct according to the platform of the party, and insert no new plank nor take one from it."

These events leave to me only one unpleasant duty, which is to declare here that I can maintain political associations with no party that insists upon such doctrines; that *I can support no man for President who avows and recognises them; and that the little of that power with which God has endowed me shall be employed to battle manfully, firmly and consistently for his defeat, demanded as it is by the highest interests of the country which owns all my allegiance.*

The PRESIDENT—The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine to be excused from further service on the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

THE REIGN OF TERROR IN KANSAS.

GOVERNOR ROBINSON TO COLONEL FREMONT.

[The following letter has been communicated to us (*The Tribune*) for publication. It narrates in the most succinct and striking manner the history of the present crisis in Kansas, and will be read universally with deep and indignant interest.]

IN "DURANCE VILE," Camp near Lecompton, }
Tuesday, June 3, 1856. }

DEAR SIR: Your note of the 15th ult. is this day received. It would afford me much pleasure to visit the East at this time, but Frank Pierce has decreed otherwise. Last Fall threats were made against Lawrence, and our citizens and the people prepared for their protection, and the place was saved; but the citizens were indicted for *treason*, because the President's tools said they only "intended" to enforce a legal process, and we were accordingly armed against the United States Government. The President, in a message and proclamation, denounced us as traitors, and indorsed the bogus officers in the Territory, and pledged them the service of the Army and Navy of the United States, and the militia of several States, to subdue the people of Kansas. In consequence of this action of the President, the people of Kansas decided to leave their towns and villages unprotected, and the President's tools to execute his will without opposition. About the 9th of last month I left for the East on business of my own, and I had no sooner left than the signal was given for the commencement of operations. I was detained by a mob at Lexington, Mo., an indictment found by a packed Jury, and a proclamation issued calling upon all who desired to destroy Lawrence to assemble under the command of the United States Marshal. The people, not believing the President intended to outrage humanity, kept about their business and offered no opposition to the officer's posse. They have, however, learned by bitter experience that there is no greater outlaw in this country than Franklin Pierce, who, after arresting a few men and disarming the people, bombarded the town, blew up and burned the best hotel in the country west of St. Louis, with its furniture, destroyed two printing offices, burned my house, barn and outbuildings, with furniture, library, papers, wearing apparel and everything inflamable; robbed and pillaged the whole town, carrying away and destroying tens of thousands of dollars worth of property belonging to the hard-working pioneers. The men belonging to the same posse, many of whom are enrolled as his militia, have since been robbing and plundering Free State people wherever they could find them, till now the people have risen in their might and have commenced protecting themselves. Civil war now rages in Kansas, and nothing but the speedy suppression of those armed invaders under Shannon, Buford & Co., can save the country from destruction. The people are driven to madness, and will bear no more outrages, even from the President of the United States. Judge G. W. Smith, G. W. Deitzler, G. Jenkins, G. W. Brown and myself, all, save the last, the most quiet and the best citizens of Kansas, are now guarded in the open prairie by United States troops under charge of *treason*, here to remain till next September, when, if they so decide, a Jury will be packed, a mock trial will be held, and we shall be hung. Such is now the state of affairs in Kansas. The people of Kansas have determined henceforth to protect their lives and property with their own strong arms, and it is to be hoped that the people of the country will approve their course, and place some man in the Presidential chair who will not rob, plunder and persecute the citizens of infant States, because they happen to differ from him in politics. The present of our beloved country is dark and ominous of evil, the *future* is in the hands of the free voters—of the Sons of Liberty.

Very truly yours, &c., C. ROBINSON.

To the Hon. J. C. Fremont.

*** The bearer of the above letter states that Governor Robinson, four other men and three ladies—wives of three of the prisoners—are confined in two tents, under constant guard of the United States soldiers, who are regularly encamped on the plain around them. No one is allowed access to them except two men.

TESTIMONY OF MISSOURI PAPERS.

From The Booneville (Mo.) Observer.

Unless the United States Government rigorously interposes its authority in behalf of peace and order, the horrors of civil war will rage on, and we fear accumulate to such an extent as to imperil the Union. Were martial law declared by the United States in Kansas, and armed companies of men called on to disband and return to the duties of civilians and good citizens, and warned of the consequences of not doing so, there would soon be peace in Kansas. But if the issue is to be decided by the power of either party to *exterminate* the other, nothing can be anticipated but of the most gloomy character, humiliating to the patriot, and clearly indicative of those horrors which would not even end, but be aggravated by political dissolution.

From The St. Louis Evening News.

One who has read the history of the war of the roses, or the death-struggle between the Cavaliers and Roundheads in England, or who is familiar with the contest for life and death between the Whigs and Tories in the Carolinas during the Revolutionary war, or who will turn his eyes to the ruined fields and desolate valleys of Mexico, need not be told how the fiery breath of internal feuds parches a beautiful land, blasts its freshness, and withers veins through which has flowed the current that nourished the national life.

We saw yesterday, two gentlemen, citizens of Schuyler County, Illinois, who had just returned from a month's travelling in Kansas. Their names were Chadsy and Potts, and, as they have no interests in the Territory to warp their views or bias their opinions, the account they gave of affairs there may be relied on.

We learn from them that Kansas, a few months ago, a smiling, fresh and prolific land, with a bosom plethoric with abundant sustenance for the nourishment of all who might there seek a home, is now a picture of desolation. The capture of Lawrence deepened and intensified the deadly animosity that had all along existed between the Pro-Slavery and Free State parties, and was the finishing stroke to a series of preceding events which turned a silent but watchful hatred into open conflict.

The Free State men, defeated and worsted, and warned by the conduct and threats of their antagonists to expect nothing but strife, broke up their households, suspended their undertakings, allowed their fields and farms to go to wreck and waste, and retired with bitter spirits to the southern part of the Territory. There they organized themselves into companies, as a defensive and offensive measure—to defend themselves from the attacks of their enemies, and for the purpose more effectually of attacking them. The Free State men, being on the frontiers of the Territory, with their enemies between them and the only channel of escape, the Missouri River, and being prevented, by the constant apprehension of attacks, from tilling their fields, are in a precarious situation, and will have to depend on wild game for sustenance. That body of good citizens, once numerous in the Territory, who sided with neither party, but attended to their own affairs, regardless of the issue of the dispute, is not now to be found. Every man has been compelled to join one party or the other, and to become active in its behalf. The substance of the Territory is devoured by the roving roystering bands of guerilla fighters, who, under the plea that war prevails, perpetrate deeds of robbery, rapine, slaughter and pillage, that nothing can justify.

Our informant states that on their return from the interior of the Territory they met large companies of men from Missouri, marching against the Free State men. They had been incited by the false and exaggerated reports of massacre and atrocities committed by the Free State party, and declared their determination to cut off the escape of the Abolitionists and starve them to death. Mr. Chadsy and Mr. Potts were frequently insulted and stopped on their way by these armed bands, and compelled to give an account of themselves.

All over the Territory, along the roadside, houses are deserted and farms abandoned, and nowhere are there visible evidences of industry. Society is utterly disorganized, laws disregarded, labour palsied, and order unknown. This is a deplorable and distressing picture, and yet a truthful one. Surely, one would think if the President owes any duty to Kansas, that duty is to use the United States troops in arresting the bands of Missourians marching against the Free State settlements, and the roving bands of Free State men who are organized for pillage and plunder, and in preventing those conflicts that are now almost daily taking place. It is worse than folly, it is madness, to call on one party in Kansas to keep the other quiet and subordinate. Both parties should be kept quiet by the strong arm of the Government.

LAWRENCE, Kansas, June 6, 1856.

To the Editor of The Missouri Democrat:

Mr. John Upton, Sergeant-at-arms to the Kansas Committee, was taken prisoner by the regulators, yesterday, and detained one day, while on his way from Westport to this city. He was travelling alone and came upon a camp of Col. Buford's men, who commanded him to halt and remain a prisoner with them.

Information of Mr. Upton's arrest was conveyed to Mr. Oliver, who set about immediately to procure his release, stating that it would not do to arrest one of their officers; better arrest every man in Kansas than him, for in Congress a fearful storm would be raised, and we should not soon hear the last of it. Mr. Mordecai Oliver, M. C., was successful in his attempt to free Mr. Upton from custody. The released Sergeant-at-arms returned to Westport, and started again this morning for Lawrence, in company with Messrs. Hunt and Johnson, both of this city. Their carriage was again stopped by the regulators, and Hunt and Johnson searched. Mr. Upton was not again molested. After searching the gentlemen, the following pass was given and the carriage allowed to proceed:

"Let the bearer pass, as his wagon has been searched at this place.

"Westport, Mo. [Signed] COL. TREADWELL.

"Per John W. Powell."

By using their pass they came through in safety. The following is a sample of the passes given to travellers by the celebrated Sam. Salters (not Sam. Lattus):

"*Let this man pas i no him* two be a *Law* and ann abidin Sittisen. [Signed] SAMUEL SALTERS, depy sherf."

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

WASHINGTON, Monday, June 16, 1856.

The mob-law party of the Missouri border has sent a fitting representative here to stir up the Executive to a more active and unwavering support of its interests. The delegate is the Dr. Stringfellow who probed the horrible wound of Jones, and who is noted for his foul-mouthed abuse of the Free State immigrants. As a sample of the wretch's brutal nature, the fact may be recalled that, on the last 4th of July, he advised the Pro-Slavery mob of Lecompton to celebrate the day by hanging an Abolitionist. This counsel was given through the Border Ruffian print of which he is editor, and which is the Government organ for the Territory. This fellow, so entirely worthy the confidence of this Administration, is said to have informed the President that the newspaper accounts of disturbances in Kansas were greatly exaggerated, and that all his party asked was the withdrawal of the United States troops. This last hint is thrown out as a brag that the Pro-Slavery party will soon make mince-meat of their adversaries if only allowed to get at them.

The truth seems to be, that without the assistance of the corrupt Federal Judges and the packed and hireling Grand Juries, the Whitfields, Stringfellows and their crew who rove about insulting, annoying, pillaging and murdering settlers, would be promptly expelled from the Territory by the very means they have invoked for crushing out the Free State men. I have myself no doubt whatever of the result of an open conflict of arms in which the United States should be neutral. The drunken braggarts whom Shannon has imported from South Carolina, Missouri and the South generally, as his militia, would be exterminated by their own vices, by privation, by disease and by the calm courage and discipline of men fighting for their free homes.

As to Stringfellow's assertion that the stories of outrages in Kansas are exaggerated, that is undoubtedly true, so far as they come to us through the lying channel of the Missouri border papers. One of them, *The Missouri Messenger*, of June 7, says: "There is no use in disguising the fact that our border counties are upon the eve of emptying themselves into the Territory of Kansas, and declaring a *war of extermination* against those Abolition outlaws." Is that an Abolition lie?

In the meantime, it is asserted upon Border Ruffian authority that that distinguished Law-and-Order chieftain, Gen. Whitfield, has raised an army on his own account, and has levied war upon Col. Sumner, whom his worthies threaten to hang if they catch him.

MR. M. F. CONWAY.—We have just had the pleasure of an hour's interview with Judge Conway, who has escaped from the hands of the Kansas assassins, and is now direct from Lawrence. We have room only to state one fact which he communicated, and which we think it important for the people of the North to know—one which should be stated in justice to the brave hearts now in Kansas. It is this, that all the Free State settlers have resolved to stay in the Territory and maintain their ground, in hopes that the North will speedily send them aid. No Free State man, he informs us, leaves the Territory, unless pressed by some urgent business. They feel it a point of honour and duty to stand their ground. The report in circulation that they are escaping into Nebraska is not true. Some few of the women and children have left the Territory, but the men remain to defend their homes and avenge their wrongs. We have only space to ask what do honour and duty require of those at the North who have encouraged these men to take this position of danger? Will they shrink from their support now in the hour of their terrible peril, because, in their defence, they must come in conflict with the General Government? If so, they are base and heartless cravens, and deserve the enslavement they will receive at the hands of the Slave Power, through the Government, to which they cowardly submit.—*Ohio A. S. Bugle.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1856.

THE ABOLITIONISTS AS PROPHETS.

WHOEVER has been an attentive reader of Anti-Slavery literature and journalism for the last fifteen or twenty years, cannot but have been struck with the spirit of prophecy that runs through it all. To be sure, the Abolitionists may be said to belong to that large class of prophets who help to bring about the accomplishment of their own predictions. But it is a proof that they have known what they wanted, and also how best to bring it about. They have had a clear vision from the beginning of the way in which they were to walk and of the work which they had to do. They acted on certain fixed principles, basing their measures on the nature of things and the nature of man; and, as their principles were eternally right, and their views of man and his ways founded on reason and experience, and as their speculations and their practice had no taint of selfishness in them, it was almost inevitable that they should see clearly and act sagaciously. Only, they have not seen half that was to come to pass, and the times were hidden from them, so that they are astonished at the haste with which the procession of events hurries past, in spite of the Second Sight which discerned their coming shadows in the distant future.

Among the many predictions which they have uttered, or rather the many statements they have made, as to what must come to pass, the one which, five or six years ago, seemed the wildest, was the necessary division of the nation into two parties—the Northern and the Southern—of which the principles should be Slavery and Anti-Slavery. Five years ago, what seemed more unlikely than that the nation should be divided into strictly Sectional parties as it is now? The Whigs were running up their bids for slaveholding support with a desperation which showed that they had abandoned any other hope of success. Daniel Webster had abandoned all hope of a North and had flung himself and all he had at the feet of the Slavemasters as his last and only chance for the eminence he sighed for. They spurned him away, to be sure, and sent him broken-hearted into his grave; but they appointed both the candidates and elected the one they loved the best. The idea of a Northern party, of a party which should not extend its ramifications into the Southern States, was regarded as something worse than a chimera, as a positive imagining of the death of the Republic, as a positive misprision of treason. What a change has come over the dreams of the people since then! The Whig party, five years ago in power and with a reasonable prospect of maintaining it, now dispersed, is demolished and ground to powder. Their very name has vanished from the face of the earth—or existing only as a mockery and a laughing-stock. The Abolitionists foresaw that all this must come to pass; but they did not dream of its accomplishing itself so soon. That the National parties should sooner or later divide on the only real matter of dispute existing in the country was inevitable; but they could not anticipate the headlong desperation or the assured insolence of the Slaveholders which has hastened on the day they would have postponed had they been wise.

But the lines are now drawn and the hosts are encamped over against each other. The attempt to keep up a delusive alliance with natural enemies has been abandoned. The true character of the Slaveholders, the nature of their designs, the necessity of their aggressions, the impossibility of their being anything but treacherous, have been growing more and more plainly to be discerned of all men. The Abolitionists have been telling these things in the ears of the people for a quarter of a century. They have had a double part in what has come to pass, both by preparing the minds of the people of the North and by compelling the people of the South to the very atrocities which have startled the North into attention. Nothing but the madness which ushers in destruction and the pride which goeth before a fall, on the part of the Slaveholders, could have roused the sluggish North from its comfortable dreams of wealth and luxury and made it put itself even into a posture of resistance. The Compromises, the Fugitive Slave Bill, the Repeal of the Ordinance of 1787, the dragooning of Slavery into Kansas, all these things, and many more, have forced open the eyes of the Northern people, reluctant as they have ever been to look at anything which demanded resolute effort and determined self-sacrifice. The attempt to intimidate the Northern members of Congress by the assassination of a Senator in his seat was precisely the kind of concentrated symbolical expression of the state of mind and of plan on the part of the enemy which was needed to crown the work. The North is in a state of excitement, temporary perhaps, but real for the time, and the widening lines of division between the North and South are growing deep and distinct.

It is long since this paper took the ground that the first thing, though by no means the only thing, needful was the formation of Sectional parties—of parties distinctly Northern and Southern, and, of necessity, Slavery and Anti-Slavery. We rejoice that our eyes behold the day of that beginning of the end. Not that we have any very exalted hopes from the success of the Republican party, even if we considered its success as a very likely thing. It is only Anti-Slavery constructively and by inference, as Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker were rioters and rescuers according to the gloss of Judge Curtis. It disavows any design upon Slavery in the States, and it has avowed no hostility to the Fugitive Slave law. Indeed, by the admission of Judge McLean among the list of its candidates, a man who stands alongside of Commissioners Curtis and Loring, and Ingraham and Morton as a negro-catcher, and who is far in advance of them and of Kane and Grier as a maker of pro-slavery Judge Law—we say by admitting him among the possibilities of a nomination, they gave assurance of their disposition to respect the *status quo* as to that matter. All that it proposes to itself is to keep Slavery out of Kansas, provided the actual settlers there do not want to have it in. This is a very small platform for a great party to stand upon, it must be owned; and in rejoicing to see it, we certainly are grateful for very moderate mercies. But it is not the platform that is significant—it is not the point nominally at issue that is the material thing. The position is everything. It is the attitude that is expressive and encouraging. It is the entire separation of the party from all Southern Alliance, and from all possibility of Slaveholding help, that gives it its encouraging aspect and makes it, with all its shortcomings, a thing to thank God for.

We need hardly say that we do not look upon this new party as one that should supersede the Anti-Slavery Movement. It has sprung from that movement, and whatever of strength and hope it has lies in the Anti-Slavery feeling of the Northern mind. It is in vain that servile men-pleasers seek to separate this effect from its Anti-Slavery origin. The Slaveholders stamp it with its real character and describe it better than it likes to do itself. But, even if successful, what results does it propose to itself to satisfy the demands of an Abolitionist? Slavery will be kept out of Kansas, provided the actual settlers do not want it—in which case the Republican party is as much bound to respect its will as that of Missouri or South Carolina. As to all the other particulars of doctrine or practice relating to Slavery—the rendition of fugitives, the suppression of insurrections, the three-fifths clause—it is at best non-committal. Indeed, in some form or other, it is bound to all these things by the oath to support the Constitution which it must take at the threshold of power. The Abolitionists can by no means recognise such a party as this as the Deliverer of the Slaves. It is at best only a forerunner—one going before to prepare the way. It does not propose even the deliverance of the Slaves as its immediate or remote object. It is true that the differing sagacities of the Slaveholders and the Abolitionists both discern that this must be the ultimate result, if it goes forward. But it must take many a step forward before those who look upon all public affairs with the eyes of the slaves can give it any direct coöperation. Indirect help we cannot avoid giving it. Every paper we issue, every meeting we hold, every tract we distribute, every lecturer we send out, is a help to whatever political organization has or professes Anti-Slavery propensity. This we cannot help. But to make our testimony effectual, we must keep it pure. We have withstood the voice of many a political charmer, charming as wisely as it knew how, and the present condition of the country is the proof of the wisdom of our resistance. Our mission is to criticise and not to help political organizations formed under the Constitution of the United States. It is to demand justice for the slave and not protection for the white man that we have our public life. We must not suffer ourselves to be deluded by any false issues or specious appearances. We believe in no effectual help even for the white man under a form of government that crushes the black man. While we rejoice to see men roused to make the attempt, and while we shall watch their efforts with a deep interest, we cannot join in a movement which we are sure cannot be effectual, even if successful,

an excitement among you. What has he done, whilst in England, to make him so much of a hero? Is it that he has left you in a state of diplomatic embroilment with us? or what is it?

Will the full particulars of the Cincinnati slave case be published in a separate form? It would prove a most valuable tract, containing so many points bearing on the cause. The state in which slaves live is shown to be fearful, for a mother deliberately chose death for her child sooner than permit it to live in slavery; a so-called *Christian* pursues this unfortunate mother, and forces her to this dread extreme of murder; the power of the State is as nothing when brought into collision with the interests of a slaveholder, and your Governors and the Judges of your States are all, as it were, worse than ignored, defied by slavery. The *Christian* is permitted to play fast and loose with his word, when it suits his purpose, and thus the very foundation of *all* morality, *truth between man and man*, is set at naught; and, as a general conclusion, all this is done by United States Law, manifesting the pro-slavery character of the Constitution, and the futility of the quibbling about the anti-slavery character of that document. A well-written tract containing all the facts, with the briefest possible comment, would be valuable. I am curious to hear whether we have heard the last of this case, or whether there will be any steps taken to show that Ohio has some real anti-slavery energy in her.

Have you noticed the effect of the scene last year between George Thompson and Mr. Samuel Gurney at the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery annual meeting? They only have a *Reunion of Friends* this year, and no public meeting. The good friends seem to be afraid of such another public display.

DOUGHFACE VIEW OF THE SUMNER OUTRAGE.

To the Editors of The Standard:

When the Senate of the United States was called upon to take action in the matter of the slaveholders' conspiracy to murder Mr. Sumner, the negro-driving Senators sat mum. Their white negroes—such as Cass, Douglas, Toucey, Bigler, Pugh, &c.—sat mum. The whole horde of Senators who get their living by cheating negroes, according to law, showed plainly that they approved the outrage, and therefore they would not move. Their sneaking subalterns, if they did not approve, did not dare disapprove. As it was evident that the slave tyrants would do nothing themselves, nor let their Northern jackalls do it, Mr. Seward moved an investigation. To defeat the object of the investigation, the Oligarchy elected the Committee. Among those *elected* was one who boldly approved the outrage, two arrant doughfaces, and two who secretly approved the attempt at assassination. Not one honest man was put on the Committee. The character of the Report was a reflex of that of the Committee, so far as duplicity was concerned; and yet it was not half as bad as they wanted to make it. It must have two faces—one for the Slave Power, and one for the gullible Democracy North. The Report they did make is before the public. The one they wanted to make is as follows.

G.

The Committee to whom was submitted the consideration of the assault of the Hon. Preston S. Brooks, a member of the House of Representatives from the State of South Carolina, upon Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, desire to make the following Report:

That they have given the subject the mature consideration that its importance demands. They have divested themselves of all personal prejudice, party bias, and political partiality, and they have examined this unfortunate affair with the utmost care and deliberation. They find that Mr. Sumner was "not within the pale of any healthy political organization"—that the party with which he acts have, for the same reason, been excluded from all important Senatorial trusts, and they can see no sufficient reason why a Senator thus situated should thrust himself forward upon the indulgence of the Senate. Your Committee find that the assault made by the Hon. Preston S. Brooks was most severe and exemplary; that it was not inflicted to avenge any personal wrong that he himself had suffered, but as a deserved punishment for the indignity offered by Mr. Sumner, in his recent speech, to his distinguished kinsman, and through him to his cherished State. We are advised that Mr. Sumner rests his justification on the fact that what he said was not only responsive, but parliamentary. We do not think so. The law-abiding and order-loving citizens of Missouri, whose magnanimity and remarkable forbearance in the affairs of Kansas have commanded the admiration of the whole world, were stigmatized by Mr. Sumner as cruel and barbarous; the people were compared to the Thugs of Persia, and these slanders, widely circulated through the land, coupled with the charge that the whole slaveholding interest was accessory, demanded a refutation. A more noble, generous or magnanimous people than the slaveholders does not exist on the face of the earth; and it seemed eminently proper that proof of this fact, and of their unlimited determination to forbear and forgive, should go out to the world and accompany the slanderous imputations uttered by Mr. Sumner. Your Committee are not unanimous in opinion that the assault on Mr. Sumner was the most convincing evidence of these facts, and they seriously regret that such is the diseased state of the Northern mind that they cannot give utterance in this Report to their real feelings. There was nothing unparliamentary in the language of Mr. Senator Butler. He only asserted a truism—"that it was a disgrace for any gentleman to associate with Mr. Sumner"; nor do we see any discourtesy in the charge of perjury made against Mr. Sumner by Senator Douglas. Gentlemen from the South have ever claimed the constitutional right to secede from the Union whenever the interests of slavery demanded it; but no right exists in favour of liberty to ever "let the Union slide." Hence there was no excuse for Mr. Sumner's assault on the South, and still less for his most "un-American and unpatriotic" tirade against the domestic virtues of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. In most unstatesman-like language he charges him with keeping a mistress, whose praises he is ever singing, and so rabid and abusive did Mr. Sumner become, in his speech, as to denounce this mistress, on the floor of the Senate, as a harlot. Nor did he stop with his personalities here; but, forsooth, in his same speech, he speaks of the illustrious author of the glorious Nebraska-bill—a measure calculated to give quiet to the country, and indispensably necessary to carry out the true meaning and intent of the Compromise of 1850—in language of great disrespect. This eminent Senator, whose private as well as public life is above reproach—this statesman, whom we all delight to honour—was indirectly, but unequivocally, compared by Mr. Sumner to that fetid animal, whose noisome name is never mentioned in the hearing of ears polite. Your Committee are reluctantly compelled, by a high sense of duty, to report the above as the true causes of the disgraceful scene enacted in this Chamber; and, to prevent the recurrence of a like act in future, so certain to bring in its train reproach and disgrace on this honourable body, they wish to sumbit for your adoption the following resolution:

That, for the unparalleled atrocity of the act with which the Senate Chamber was disgraced on the 22d day of May, 1856, in which a severe caning was administered to Charles Sumner, by the Hon. Preston S. Brooks, of South Carolina, after the Senate had on that day adjourned, and to vindicate the character of the Senate from unjust imputation, as well as to prevent the future recurrence of a like scene, the said *Charles Sumner* is hereby expelled from this honourable body.

Mr. Brown's Drama.—The writer of the following is, we presume, Rev. David A. Wasson, Minister of the Free Church at the place where it is dated. His opinion will have great weight with all who know him.

Groveland, June 5, 1856.

Dear Mr. Garrison: Mr. Wm. Wells Brown read, last evening, his anti-slavery drama, entitled "Experience, or How to give a Northern Man a Backbone." Do you know how capital a hit it is? Our people were fairly taken off their feet with delight. I have never seen a Groveland audience so highly entertained. The drama is not only extremely amusing, but is really a very effective plea for the cause of anti-slavery. Our people seemed to feel anew what an infinite shame it is that men of so much talent as Mr. Brown should be held in the degraded condition of bondage. I hope he will read his drama in many places.

D. A. W.

A Mother Trying to Buy her Daughter.—Eliza Hamilton, who was manumitted at Washington in 1854, by the help of Gerrit Smith and other friends of freedom, is now in this city, endeavouring to collect money for the purchase of her daughter, Elizabeth, 22 years of age, the slave of Eloise Smith, of Queen Anne, Prince George Co., Md. We have entire confidence in her integrity, and commend her to the sympathy of those who can conscientiously aid her in her labour of love.

Correction.—In the speech of C. F. Hovey, copied by us last week, from *The Liberator*, he was made to say, that neither the speech of Stephen S. nor A. K. Foster would be *correct* without the other. What was said was, that "neither would be *complete* without the other."

Our Kansas Correspondence.

BORDER RUFFIANISM TRIUMPHANT.

Lawrence, May 25, 1856.

Dear Friends: You will be ready to credit the above assertion, after perusing the following narrative. Five weeks ago yesterday, Sheriff Jones entered Lawrence, and endeavoured to arrest S. N. Wood, for aiding in the rescue of Branson, last Fall. Being unsuccessful, he returned on the following Sunday, with a posse, and made another attempt to arrest Wood and sundry others. On Wednesday, he came into town again, with a few troops, and succeeded in arresting some half-dozen persons for refusing to aid in the arrest of Wood. On the evening of the same day, he was shot, while standing in his tent. A large meeting was held the next day, and strong resolutions were passed condemning the act, and $500 reward was offered by Gov. Robinson for the discovery of the assassin. An individual was seen riding into town, a little previous, and was heard to inquire for Jones. After the shooting, he left town suddenly. He is supposed to have been some pro-slavery man with whom Jones had had a claim difficulty. Be that as it may, no trace of the culprit has yet been discovered, and the Free State party is no more responsible for the deed than the Pro-Slavery party. A few days after this, Salters, Jones's deputy, attempted to enter a house in search of a transgressor, when the lady of the house repulsed him by throwing a pan of hot water into his face. Some time after this, Reeder and Robinson were subpœnaed to testify before the Grand Jury at Lecompton. They refused to appear, when writs were issued to arrest them for contempt of Court. The United States Marshal made his appearance and attempted to arrest Reeder, but he threw himself upon his privilege as a member of Congress and claimed exemption from arrest also on the ground of being connected with the Investigating Committee, then in session. The Marshal dared not arrest Reeder, and that night Robinson and Reeder absconded. Donnelson, the United States Marshal, then issued a proclamation calling upon all "law and order men" to repair to Lecompton and aid in the execution of the laws. Some 500 men obeyed this call. Some of them were from the Territory and some from Missouri, but the majority were Major Buford's company from Alabama and Georgia. Quite a number of our citizens were seized, among whom was Robinson, taken in Missouri; G. W. Brown and J. Miller, editors, the latter of whom came very near being hung.

On Wednesday night, May 14th, a quantity of guns and sabres, on their way from Kansas here, were taken at Franklin, by about 60 men; and General Pomeroy and Col. Roberts utterly opposed their being retaken. From this moment the enemy began to grow extremely bold, stealing horses and cattle, and arresting men, and stealing their property whenever they had a chance.

On Monday, the 19th inst., two of our men were murdered in cold blood, a few miles from here. The excitement had now become intense, but was increased to a fearful degree by the appearance, at sunrise on Wednesday morning, of about 300 armed men, with 4 cannon, upon the brow of the hill overlooking our town. "They have come at last," exclaimed every one, and now what shall be done? The greater part of our people were for resisting them, if they attempted to destroy, as it was rumoured they would, the printing-office and the hotel. But the "Safety Committee" forbade all resistance, and we all were obliged to hide our rifles, and abide the issue in quietness. Just think of a community of the greatest fighting men in the United States suddenly turning non-resistants, when, if ever, there was need of the use of what the enemy call "Beecher's Bibles"! I, although a non-resistant, counselled fighting; for I felt sure that if we yielded any more, we would lose everything, and Kansas would become a slave State. I sat at my window, watching the approach of the formidable army. If I ever felt solemn, it was then. Here we were, completely in the hands of 300 armed and mounted "Border Ruffians," with 4 cannon at their command and Gen. Atchison at their head. I expected death, or at least banishment from the Territory. I grasped my wife's hand and told her to promise me eternal hostility to slavery, whatever became of me. As soon as the cavalcade had reached my house, it halted and planted a cannon within a few feet of where I was sitting. I would not have given much for my life at that moment, I assure you. Soon the soldiers came to my door. Having no arms, I thought I would try the virtue of non-resistance, so I invited them in, gave them water to drink, and pies and cake to eat, and got them into quite a friendly spirit towards me. They said I should not be harmed, and they were very sorry to be obliged to do what they were going to do, but Gov. Shannon had commanded them, and they must obey. I asked them what Shannon had told them to do, and they said, "to destroy the printing-offices and the stone hotel."

These feats they accomplished, throwing the type into the river, breaking the presses into pieces and scattering the paper and books all over the streets, and bombarding the hotel. They fired 29 shots from their cannon at the hotel, and gave it up as a bad job. But few of the balls made an impression upon the solid walls. They next set fire to it, and in that way effected its complete destruction. They then plunged into the work of robbery and pillage. About $100,000 worth of property was stolen from the various houses and stores in the town—women's clothes, provisions, watches, money, notes and rifles. One man lost $6,000. I had $200 in gold, belonging to a boarder, taken from my house. Hardly a man dared to show his face in the street for some time, so that the ruffians had complete possession of our town. A body of "Kickapoo Rangers," mounted, chased me through the street, threatening to kill me, unless I would point out where the Sharp's rifles were. In the evening, Dr. Robinson's house was burned. Remember, all this was *done by the direction of Judge Lecompte*, backed by President Pierce. It was *no mob*, but only a little healthy chastisement of Uncle Sam's, in order to save our souls.

Yours, Truth.

P. S. The Grand Jury of this County found a bill against the hotel, printing-offices and Blandon's bridge, as nuisances, and Judge Lecompte, of the United States Court, ordered Sheriff Jones to abate them, which he did in the above-mentioned style. Hurrah for the glorious United States Government and for the blessed *Union!*

TESTIMONY OF A WOMAN—AN EYE-WITNESS.

[The following letter from a true-hearted and brave woman, formerly of Monroe Co., N. Y., will be read with deep interest. Her statements are worthy of implicit confidence. We suppress her name for obvious reasons.]

Kansas, May 28th, 1856.

Dear Friend: I write in haste, under the pressure of many duties, and surrounded by corroding cares and harassing troubles and anxieties. We came here this Spring, from the far East, to seek for ourselves a quiet home in a beautiful clime, and help to guard this virgin soil from the blighting curse of slavery. We settled in an enchanting spot, on the California road, seven miles from Lawrence, where we pitched our tent and commenced preparations to erect our cabin. We have been living thus for several weeks, with three young children, exposed to all the inclemences of the rainy season, and receiving rather more active hydropathic treatment, in the form of douches, shower baths and wet sheet packs, than even we, with all our devotion to the practice, could consider very agreeable or desirable. Our freight was shipped at Philadelphia, about the middle of March, comprising things indispensable to the comfort and prosperity of new settlers, and which are very difficult to obtain in this region. None of it has yet arrived or been heard from since we came, while we have constantly suffered every inconvenience from the need of it. Our boxes were very heavy, and we fear they have been suspected by the Missourians of being "contraband articles," and broken open and destroyed, as we learn that many heavy articles marked for Kansas have been thus treated, in the zeal of the "border ruffians" to interrupt all arms sent on here as a means of defence against their aggressions. But, in addition to all privations (light and nameless in comparison), we have had other far more dangerous exposures, from an armed band of desperadoes stationed near us, summoned by the United States Marshal, with a proclamation from Gov. Shannon, and acting under the direction of President Pierce. They were for two weeks encamped within a few rods of our humble home, drilling their companies every day upon our fair fields, blighting the witching beauty of our verdant carpeted prairie—their horses prancing and horsemen riding to and fro continually, and their camp fires burning, and drunken howls and fiendish yells resounding through all the night. They wore the United States belts and badges, and carried the United States muskets and bayonets, and, with this armour and Gov. Shannon's proclamation, stopped every man travelling on the road, searched him and robbed every one they pleased of any arms, money or valuables they found upon them, discharged some and carried others under arrest to their camp, and fired upon all who refused to halt and be searched at their command. They made some of our neighbours prisoners who went near their camp, killed and devoured poor men's calves and cattle, milked their cows, and stole their horses and oxen to fit up their own equipage, and have thus prevented the suffering emigrants from going on with the Spring work indispensable to even a scanty support of themselves and families. They have threatened the life of Capt. Walker, our neighbour, who was active in the Free State movement last Winter, have hunted him from his home and kept watch about for him for two weeks, and have stationed other companies about Lawrence to prevent any one entering the town, and have made arrests of all the prominent men there upon the charge of "high treason" for having refused to yield deference to the Territorial laws of the Border Ruffian Legislature. We have have seen and talked with several of these men from the encampment every day, and learn from their own testimony that they are comprised of Georgians, South Carolinians, Alabamians, Missourians, and some from Florida, and some pro-slavery men settled in the Territory; but the main body of them are a class expecting to remain only until after the election, or who have come out just for this occasion, expecting to return as soon as the Lawrence people were made to submit to "law and order." I inquired of some of them how they fared in the camp, and they told me that "many of them from the South had *never* had so good a home before; that the noble and chivalrous men who had sent them out had paid their expenses and furnished them with ample support for one year and means to preëmpt a claim, and had merely required of them a binding obligation to vote for and support slavery in the Territory." From others I heard "that some of the band had been furnished here by Uncle Sam with the first whole shirt they had ever had on their backs." The better class all assured us that no violence would be done in Lawrence, but all of the others said from the first that they had sworn to demolish the town and drive every Free State man from the Territory. The inhabitants of Lawrence resolved not to resist the United States troops, however great the indignities heaped upon them; and the "murdered Jones" (who, by the way, it is doubted by all parties has ever had a serious wound) has figured conspicuously in this transaction, and avowed their reason for not calling out the troops (instead of this conglomerated posse) to assist in making the arrests in Lawrence to be a determination to provoke them to resistance and afford some shadow of an apology for falling upon and cruelly butchering all the inhabitants. The company continued to receive reinforcements constantly until last Wednesday, when, with Stringfellow at their head, they passed on to Lawrence, entered the town unresisted, and the Marshal made all his arrests, and then nominally dismissed them, but with the full and tacit understanding (from their own testimony) that they should go on and destroy the Free State hotel, the presses and printing office, and Gov. Robinson's house, and pillage and plunder to their own satisfaction. We rode down to the bluff overlooking Lawrence and saw their army of about 800 and 7 cannon, according to their own estimate, march into the town without a shot being fired. They planted their bloody banner (the red flag of the Lone Star Order—fit emblem of the pro-slavery cause and its party) upon the parapet of the Free State hotel. The sun shone on in its glory, the river flowed as peacefully as ever, and the flowers of the prairie turned up their smiling faces to the fair blue heavens, but the Genius of Liberty shrouded her face and wept when she beheld this foul desecration of her newly-consecrated temple, and a shout as from the infernal regions rang upon the still air when the miscreants thus asserted their bloody triumph. Atchison sat upon the office of the *Herald of Freedom* and gave directions while the presses were taken and tumbled into the river. They then commenced cannonading the hotel, fired 29 balls without any effect, then attempted to blow it up, and still failed, but finally succeeded in setting fire to and burning it down. They then broke into and robbed private houses, pillaged trunks, and in several cases took every article of clothing except what the individuals had on. Many emigrants, who had just arrived in town and never had identified themselves with any party, were thus left without a change of raiment; and, on leaving the town, they pillaged many settlers on their way home, appropriating ladies' and children's dresses, and even baby toys and play-things, and the bridal apparel of newly-married couples who had come to make their future home in our fair domain. A large company, who left just after Gov. Robinson's house was burnt, not waiting for any plunder or to steal even their supper, came on here, evidently disgusted and weary. They begged for supper and privilege to encamp for the night with us. I told them that I could only entertain them in obedience to the command, "If thine enemy hunger, give him food to eat; if thirsty, give him to drink; and by so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head"; that I considered they had given to posterity, that day, the darkest page that had ever blackened the annals of history, and henceforth I was no longer an Abolitionist, but went as far ahead of that party now, in my deadly hate and loathing of slavery, as I had formerly been ahead of Northern doughfaces in this respect—that if I believed in fighting, I would go forth, like another Joan of Arc, and far more heaven-inspired, and arouse the whole country, both North and South, firmly believing that every man at the South even, who had any *manhood* left, would desert their shameful and ignominious cause and enlist under the banner of freedom and justice, and that the bonds of slavery should at once be broken and the oppressed everywhere go free—that this day's work would light the torch which should never be quenched till the last manacle should be broken from the slave or a gulf of eternal separation placed between the free North and the cowardly South. I told them I did not fear their power; they might kill me if they pleased, but, for once, I was glad of an opportunity to pour out upon them all the burning indignation of a free-born, liberty-loving woman's soul—that had I always lived in the very heart of the sunny South, and claimed as my own all the human chattels toiling there, I would emancipate them this day, if I had never before seen or recognised aught of the evils of slavery and the dreadful influences it exerted upon everything that came within its pale. Then I told them of the indignities we had suffered from them, and that life had been odious to me while compelled to the servility imposed upon us here to men who, from their appearance, I considered scarcely an advance upon the brute creation. Some of them looked out side-ways or lowering from under their eyebrows at me as they arose from the table, but remained quiet; and their leader, after I had finished talking, attempted to extenuate their conduct to me, and he and my husband discussed slavery and anti-slavery until past midnight. We never conceal our sentiments, and we are liable at any moment to be shot down, as we step to the door or walk about on our prairie. They are a desperate and ruthless set of men, and I do hope that Pierce & Co. will now stand forth to the world in their true colours as the instigators, aiders and abettors of shameful deeds, at which even savages might blush and shrink from with horror. I could fill pages with accounts of their aggressions, but I forbear. Two companies of United States troops have just passed here, on their way to Topeka, avowedly for the purpose of preventing similar outrages there to those perpetrated upon Lawrence, but *apparently* to prevent any uprising of the Free State party; and it was the proud boast of all the ruffians, while here, that they did "not fear the vengeance of the Free State party, nor the civil war (which all calculate must inevitably ensue), for the Executive was on their side and could command the army and the navy against the North." Lieut. McIntosh said to me, this morning, that the Lawrence people should have defended themselves, and seemed to blame them because they did not, while all these arrests are made of the very men who resisted the pro-slavery authority last Winter, and for that very reason. You cannot conceive how inconsistent and absurd are all the positions they take, and it is very evident that Shannon, Atchison and the Marshal will all try to screen themselves from the opprobrium that must henceforth attach to their names in connection with this affair, by shirking the responsibility and pretending that they did not direct the outrages upon private property, whereas there was a tacit understanding among them all that all these atrocities, and even greater, should be done, and Jones carried in his pocket the order to demolish the hotel, the presses and Blandon's bridge as nuisances. They called it an indictment of the Free State hotel, presses, bridge, &c. We have not yet learned whether they indicted the bricks that fell and crushed to death one of their party, or the Sharp's rifle that kicked the bucket and shot a ruffian who was attempting to fire it. I am satisfied that the East do not receive reliable statements of the proceedings in Kansas, or the wants of the people here. And I believe all the arms that have been sent on have proved a curse instead of a help. At any rate, they have now fallen into the hands of the pro-slavery party, to be used to kill the very men whom they were intended to defend. The little brass howitzer which the Eastern Company considered such a great affair was taken by the South Carolina company and borne, with shouts of triumph and much rejoicing, past our cabin, the next morning. The leader of this company, with musket and bayonet and belt stuck full of revolvers and bowie-knives, stopped us on the way to Lawrence, the other day, and, in the most insolent manner, accused us of being spies from that town. We assured him we had not been in town for two weeks. He said, "I saw you pass up from there this morning." We told him again that we had but just left our home, and he again contradicted, and my husband then said, "I will not allow you to question my veracity again," and in such an indignant and decided manner that I expected the whole party of Southern ruffians would fire upon us. But this slight exhibition of courage seemed to cower them down considerably, though they went on with the most horrid oaths, swearing "that this should be a slave State; and that even if not, they would bring their slaves, and keep them here, too, in defiance of Heaven or Hell." Last Sabbath I was so annoyed by the constant firing and drilling and infernal noises this troop kept up so near us that I got the children asleep, and, my husband being gone, I went off down the ravine to seek some quiet, but soon heard guns discharged from our cabin, and one ball came near me; and upon returning, I found a party of the most brutal among them assembled around the door; they had been in and searched the cabin, and I inquired of them if they had orders to thus disturb peaceable citizens and fire around their houses on the Sabbath day. They replied that they had orders to go where they pleased and do what they pleased, and should fire when and where they pleased—that "Gov. Shannon had called them out, and they were acting by his and President Pierce's orders." Many of those who came on from Missouri are now peddling the flour and provisions they stole in Lawrence, and sometimes the Missourians steal back the cows and oxen they have sold at enormous prices to Free State men here. These also sometimes stray back when they are turned out to graze, and are often killed or sold over again.

Now, methinks the Emigrant Aid Societies in New York and in the Eastern States are all a perfect *humbug*. Why don't they send on the right kind of men and women, and means to use for building comfortable, convenient dwellings, mills, &c., and carry on all the arts of peace? The influence of the war last Winter has been very deleterious to enterprise and morals in and about Lawrence, and now poor settlers ruined. I cannot learn of any real material aid any one has received here from all the donations and subscriptions at the East, while many poor worthy families are suffering privations which you, in your comfortable homes, can have no conception of, and there are no mechanic shops as yet; and such a scarcity of mills, we must go many miles for a few boards to shelter us from rain, or even to get a horse shod or a plough-point ground, and then pay enormous prices, and pay twice as much for flour from Missouri as you do for the best in New York City. Will not some one at the East take proper means to remedy some some of these great and crying evils?

You are at liberty to use any or all of these facts and statements from an eye-witness. Publish them in The Standard, or any or every anti-slavery paper, where you think they may do most good.

The Slave Trade in New York.—The brig *Braman*, after being closely watched for some time by the United States authorities, on suspicion that she was about to leave this port as a slaver, was overhauled on the 9th inst., as she was passing out of the harbour, and brought back. There is no room for doubt that she was intended for a slaver, but it is not yet certain that the fact can be legally proved. If condemned, she will be a rich prize for her captors; but we fear that both vessel and crew will escape. *The Tribune* says:

"The most peculiar feature on the brig is a low bulk-head or guard, a foot or so high, running across the upper deck, just aft the foremast, with extra scuppers pierced inside. This guard is caulked and white-leaded water-tight. Its use is to keep the spray and water which break over the bows from wetting that part of the deck upon which the negro women and boys are penned. While the men are stowed below, they generally carry the women and boys on the upper deck under an awning. This guard is peculiar to slavers, and, so far as we know, is never seen on any other vessel.

"Those who profess to be acquainted with the details of the slave trade assert that when it is desirable to save the vessel they take in a small cargo of palm oil, on the West Coast, and construct their slave deck over the casks. They then load up with human beings and make with all speed for Cuba or Brazil. After landing their living cargo the slave deck is pitched overboard, and the vessel comes into New York or any other American port, as though she had cleared from the West Coast with a legitimate cargo of palm oil, duly consigned and safely delivered. Whether the shooks in the Braman are intended for this purpose or not can only be determined after further investigation.

"Owing to the great demand for Africans in Cuba and Brazil, and the high prices which they obtain, the slave trade of New York has lately received a great impetus. Since our report of the capture and confiscation of the Falmouth, several other slavers have fitted out here and sailed for the African coast without molestation, having managed their affairs so adroitly that no legal obstacle could be interposed to their departure. But, in order to elude the vigilance of the authorities, they have had to resort to all sorts of stratagems. For instance, they drop down to the lower bay, or sail to some secluded part of the Sound, and there take on board the outfit from a tender. In some cases they even go outside of Sandy Hook before venturing to receive the criminating evidence of their unlawful mission. A few days ago, a schooner took her rice, coppers and lumber for slave deck, from the east end of Long Island, and sailed for "St. Thomas and a market." Every vessel which sails from this port as a slaver is known and watched from the commencement of her fitting-out to the time she puts to sea. But, as the cost of capturing one of them, which is very considerable, in the hire of steamboats, pay of assistants, and other incidental expenses, must be borne by the United States Deputy Marshals, without reimbursements if they do not succeed in convicting the offenders, it is fair to presume that they would rather err on the safe side than go ahead and make the seizure, without good prospect of realizing a handsome prize, in addition to their outlay. Therefore, it may be set down as certain, that they have ample proof of the illegal character of the voyage upon which a vessel is bound, before they go to the expense and run the risk of intercepting her. Hence it will be understood why so few seizures are made, compared with the number engaged in the trade, which fit out at this port."

The National Republican Convention, for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, assembled in Philadelphia, in the Musical Fund Hall, on Tuesday last. All the free States, three slave States (Maryland, Virginia and Kentucky), the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Minnesota, Kansas and Nebraska, were represented. The whole number of delegates was about 560, and among them were many men of eminent ability and large influence.

Hon. Robert Emmett, of this city, an old Democrat, was chosen as temporary chairman. Hon. Henry S. Lane, of Indiana, was elected permanent President. The enthusasm of the Convention rose to the highest pitch at the very beginning. Little was done on the first day, beyond the appointment of the necessary Committees, and much of the time was occupied in speaking.

On Wednesday the platform was presented, and adopted with great unanimity. (We shall publish it hereafter.) And then came the struggle for the Presidential nomination. The choice was mainly between two men, Fremont and McLean, though Chase and Seward had each their friends. Pennsylvania and New Jersey were warmly in favour of McLean, but the tide set so strongly for Fremont that all other candidates were withdrawn even before the informal ballot. The result of that ballot was, McLean 196, Fremont 359. A *formal* ballot was soon afterwards taken, with the following result: Seward 1, McLean 37, Fremont 514. The nomination was then made unanimous, and the Convention adjourned to Thursday morning, when the nomination for Vice-President would be made.

Littell's Living Age.—The crowded state of our columns for several weeks has prevented us from acknowledging the receipt of the current numbers of this work. No. 630—the last received—opens with the London *Quarterly's* review of Southey's Letters, and contains besides the following articles: Gipsies of the Danube; James G. Percival; Kate Coventry—Chapter XVII., &c.; Myra's Wish—a Fary Tale; The Protocols; The Forbidden Subject; New Holy Alliance; The Press in Belgium; French Official Panphlet; Poetry; Short Articles. New York: 343 Broadway.

The Panorama of Life and Literature, for June, made up of selections from the current numbers of the *Living Age*, is exceedingly interesting. Its unrivalled excellence and cheapness ($3 per annum) should commend it to popular favour. Boston: Littell, Son & Co.

Household Words (American Reprint), for June, contains a great variety of interesting matter. We renew our hearty commendation of this work. Dix and Edwards, 321 Broadway.

Never, in all our experience as the conductors of an anti-slavery paper, were we so much embarrassed by the pressure of important matter as at present. We can find room for only a tithe of that which we are anxious to lay before our readers.

Summary.

The resolution inviting Mr. Everett to deliver his discourse on Washington before the Connecticut Legislature, which was laid on the table in the Senate, on account of a report that he had declined to participate in the Faneuil Hall meeting, has been passed.

"In Mr. Pierce," says the Virginia planters, or may be supposed to say, "you have an old cigar, not of the first quality, to begin with, smoked to the stump. What shall we do with the disgusting remnant? It has served the purpose for which it was made, and is only fit to be thrown into the street and trampled under foot. With your leave I will help myself to a clean one from the cigar case."—*N. Y. Post.*

Honours Paid to Mr. Pierce at his Home.—On Thursday morning the effigies of Franklin Pierce and Preston S. Brooks were hanging in front of the State House, Concord, eighty feet from the ground, on the Pierce and King Liberty pole, erected in 1852. An effigy of Col. George hung in another part of the city, bearing an inscription upon his front: "The glorious and God-like Administration of Franklin Pierce."

The Fourth Generation.—Among the speakers at the indignation meeting in Quincy last week, young John Quincy Adams, the eldest son of Charles Francis Adams, grandson of John Quincy Adams, and great grandson of John Adams, made an eloquent speech in behalf of the rights of freedom. It is a gratifying fact to record in these columns that we have not yet seen "the last of the Adamses." It is a glorious name, and we hope it will ever be a prominent one wherever the liberty of man is assailed.—*Bos. Trans., June 9.*

The Courage of Mr. Sumner.—An effort has been pretty generally made by the pro-slavery newspapers to create the impression that Mr. Sumner did not show a courageous spirit when attacked by Brooks. The following, which we find in the Washington correspondence of the Boston *Telegraph*, puts a very different face upon the matter:

"Brooks has told one of his friends, in the bearing of a friend of mine, that Mr. S. showed such courage when he raised his cane, by the glance of his eye, that he almost quailed; and that he knew that if he had not stunned him at the first blow that he would have been in a 'bad fix.'"

A Fugitive from Labour.—The British schooner Victory, from Nassau, which arrived here yesterday, had on board a black man by the name of John, the property of Dr. Carrere, of this city. He was placed on board the Victory by Captain Macfarlane, of the British bark Intrinsic, when off Cape Romain, on Monday last, having been discovered snugly stowed away in the long boat of the bark a short time previous. The Intrinsic sailed from this port for Liverpool on Saturday last, and Captain Macfarlane very correctly put his vessel about as soon as information was given him that the negro was on board, and was on his way here when he fell in with the Victory.—*Charleston Mercury, 10th.*

Hon. Henry Wilson is now seeing the proudest day that can come in any man's life. Without having particular regard to any party, he has, in the last twenty years, gone forward as self-reliant as though he formed every circumstance about him and, when necessary, could change them at will. As he has crossed the path of politicians, now they have cheered, and now they have denounced, and he has seemed equally uninfluenced by both. After the election, last year, a shout went up from his opponents as though he would never breathe again; but to-day the mouths that cursed him are wide open with praise. The Boston *Advertiser*, speaking of the Faneuil Hall meeting on Tuesday evening, says: "Mr. Wilson was introduced as a gentleman who believed not only in the defence of freedom, but in self-defence, and was cheered as we never heard a man cheered in Faneuil Hall before."—*Newburyport Herald.*

Another Victim to Slavery.—An esteemed friend at the West writes us an account of the arrest of a coloured man, named James Peck, on a charge of aiding a slave to escape. He was cook on a little steamer, the Ella, which plied between Cincinnati and Nashville. The charge is, that he and the stewardess secreted a slave on board, intending to bring him to Cincinnati. The stewardess was observed taking food from the table every meal, and going aft with it: the Captain followed her one day, and found the fugitive secreted under her bed. Peck, the stewardess and the slave were put in jail at Hawesville, Ky., to await the return of the boat, when they will be taken to Nashville and delivered to the authorities for trial. Poor creatures! they will, doubtless, be sent to the penitentiary. The stewardess is a mother, with a babe only a few months old.—*Frederick Douglass's Paper.*

The following statement appears in *The Herald* of yesterday, in the form of a telegraphic despatch sent from Washington on Wednesday:

"A telegraphic despatch was sent to-day to Lorenzo B. Shepherd, Esq., from this city, *not to allow John Van Buren to speak* at the ratification meeting in New York to-night."

If there be a lower depth of human degradation than plummet ever sounded till now, surely those "Barnburners" who are going for Buchanan have attained or are now diving for it. As to John Van Buren, who long since repudiated his convictions and his professions of regard for liberty in his eagerness for place and power, advertising the public that he had quit "watching negroes in Nebraska" and should attend henceforth to winning bread for himself and family, it was fit that he should sit speechless by order in the balcony at the Buchanan Ratification and hear Douglas berate all the Barnburners tried to do.—*Tribune.*

Mr. Sumner.—Mr. Sumner is improving as fast as could be reasonably expected, after the very severe concussion his brain must have suffered. The wounds of the scalp are healing, but his nervous system has not yet recovered its usual tone, and it would be sheer folly for him to think of taking his seat in the Senate, or resuming accustomed labours, in his present condition. The wonder to us is that, under such blows as were dealt with all the might of a powerful arm, his cerebral organization should have escaped without radical injury. Much time and care will be required for the restoration of his wonted health. We need hardly say to his friends that he bears this affliction with the quiet dignity and cheerful patience of a man who can see no humiliation in being made the victim of unexpected violence, and is incapable of stooping to the indulgence of the low passion of revenge.—*National Era, 12th.*

Mr. Sumner is now in Maryland, at the country residence of Francis P. Blair, Esq., receiving every attention which kindness can suggest.—*Boston Telegraph, June 17.*

Fugitives from Prejudice.—A correspondent of the Cincinnati *Price Current*, writing from New Orleans, says:

"In the list of names recently published of Americans at the French Court, who had been received by the Emperor and Empress, we find the names of a family of five persons recently belonging to this city. The family possessed wealth, lived in an elegant house on one of the most fashionable streets—it was elegantly furnished and decorated with paintings. They drove about in their carriage. The daughters were educated by private instruction in all the branches of education, useful as well as ornamental, but they could not have any society, or be admitted into the Opera House, on account of the tinge of coloured blood on the mother's side; her daughters now standing the eighth generation removed from the negro, though to all appearance they were as white as any one you would meet on the street. Of course their situation was very uncomfortable for them here. Last year, they sold off house, furniture and everything, at considerable sacrifice, and left for France. Since their arrival there, we hear that one of the daughters has married a foreign Embassador at the Court of Louis Napoleon."

Kentucky View of South Carolina.—The editor of the Louisville *Journal*, George D. Prentice, writes thus in an article concerning the late outrage in the Senate Chamber at Washington:

"There were twice as many traitors in South Carolina in the days of the Revolution as in any other State, in proportion to population, and we think that her soil, as a general rule, grows worse men now than it did then.

"The shameful imbecility of South Carolina from slavery during the Revolution, and its more shameful assumptions for slavery since, to say nothing of its hordes of Tories during the Revolution and ever since, is so clearly seen in the history of our country that it is surprising anybody out of South Carolina should pronounce it libelous, or be so shameless as to attack Sumner (by way of making a sneaking justification of Brooks) for flinging the bard fact in the teeth of the blustering bullies who truly represent in Congress that pestilent State, which, with absurd insolence and vanity, claims to be *the* State—*par excellence*, the Commonwealth of the continent.

"The honours ascribed to South Carolinians for bravery in the Revolution by Webster, and the common consent of mankind belonged not to the slaveholders, but to the 'poor white trash,' so despised then and now by their lordly neighbours. The oligarchy of South Carolina was as tremulous then at the idea of war with England, and had the palsy of conservatism, as now."

Josiah Quincy on the Sumner Outrage.—The following is a sketch of the remarks of Hon. Josiah Quincy, Sen., at the indignation meeting in Quincy, Mass.:

"Already eighty-five years, and standing on the brink of the grave, the sands of life already fast settling away from under me, what I have to say is the pure prompting of an honest heart. The blow struck upon the head of Charles Sumner did not fall upon him alone. It was a blow purposely aimed at the North. It was a blow struck at the very tree of liberty. It speaks to us in words not to be mistaken. It says to us that Northern men shall not be heard in the halls of Congress, except at the peril of the bowie-knife, the bludgeon and revolver. Nor is this any new thing.

"The bludgeon, heretofore only brandished, has at last been brought down, and now is the time for the North to fight. Charles Sumner needs not our sympathy; if he dies, his name will be immortal; his name will be enrolled with the names of Warren, Sidney and Russell; if he lives, he is destined to be the light of the nation.

"J. Q. Adams once said to me, 'the characteristics of Southern Representatives are boldness, fearlessness and desperation; while the characteristics of the Northern Representatives have always been dog tim

Miscellaneous Department.

From Dwight's Journal of Music.

TELL'S DEATH.

FROM THE GERMAN OF UHLAND.

When once the avalanche thunders,
The Alp is green again;
The herds go up the mountain,
The snow runs down the plain.
To you, ye Alpine children,
The ice, the Spring sets free,
Each year renews in emblem
The fight of Liberty.

See where the thundering Schächen
Down through the gorges leaps,
And rock and fir fall crashing
Where'er his torrent sweeps.
The bridge is crushed and buried
A boy just crossing over
Is with it washed away.

It chanced, that very moment,
An old man neared the verge,
To save the boy, he, fearless,
Leaps down into the surge;
Grasps him with eagle-swiftness,
And bears him safe to shore;
The child escapes—his saviour
Hath sunk to rise no more.

And when the flood ejected
His body, robbed of life,
There stood around him, sobbing
And sorrowing, man and wife.
As if old Rothstock, crashing,
From its foundations fell,
Burst from one mouth the grief-cry:
"'Tis Tell is dead! 'tis Tell!"

Were I an Alpine herdsman
On the eternal snow,
Were I a daring boatman
On Uri's lake below,
And had I, in my sorrow,
Come near where Tell lay dead,
My arm his head enfolding,
My wail I thus had said:

"There liest thou, pale and lifeless,
Who was the life of all;
Thy hoary locks still fondly
Around thy pale face fall.
Here stands, whom thou hast rescued,
A child, like milk and blood;
The land thou hast unfettered,
Lo! Alpine glories flood!

"The love that to the rescue
Of this young struggler flew
Had been in thee the courage
That erst the tyrant slew.
Unsleeping and unshrinking,
To help was aye thy way;
So was it in thy brown locks,
So was it in thy gray.

"Hadst thou been still a young man,
When thou the boy didst save,
And hadst thou then been rescued
From this thy watery grave,
Thence had we well concluded
Fame should one day be thine;
Yet *after* great achievements,
The hero's homeliest shine.

"Thine ear has rung with voices
That praised thee loud and high,
Yet could it stoop to listen
To misery's feeblest cry.
He is the freeman's hero
Who, though with victory crowned,
Yet burns for deeds of goodness
No trump of Fame shall sound.

"Unscathed, we saw thee coming
Back from the work of wrath;
Thy fortune first forsook thee
In pity's humble path.
Heaven asked not, for a people,
Thy life in sacrifice,
But, for this child surrendered,
'Twas held a precious prize.

"Where thy sure shaft, like lightning,
Straight to the Vogt's heart went,
There stands a chapel open,—
Vengeance, thy monument!
But here, where thou hast perished
To save a child, alone
For a memorial hast thou
A humble cross of stone.

"Well far and wide 'tis sounded
How thou thy land hast freed,
The tongues of mighty poets
Shall give to Fame the deed;
But when, at eve, the herdsman
Comes down the Schachen's side,
The rocks, Tell's name resounding,
Shall utter how he died."

C. T. B.

CURIOSITIES OF HISTORY.

THE following historical gleanings are curious and instructive illustrations of the principles and practices of our immediate progenitors. They are fixed facts—finger-boards along the highways of human progression:

The first Legislative Assembly in America was the Governor of Virginia, Council, and a number of Burgesses, who assembled in one Chamber, at Jamestown, 1617.

In 1620–21, one hundred and fifty young women, of "agreeable manners," were sent from England to Virginia, and sold to the planters for wives, 120 to 150 pounds of tobacco, cash. This traffic in wives continued many years, and in 1632 two young women were seduced on their passage out, and were immediately sent back, as "unworthy to propagate the race of Virginians." Indeed, so scarce and valuable were "agreeable" women in 1624 that a fine was imposed on any woman who should encourage more than one suitor at a time. This was to obviate the inconvenience resulting from the "ardour and frequency of amorous competition."

"The early chivalric cavaliers of the Old Dominion were hardly up to the spirit of the present age, as appears from the following letter of Sir William Berkeley, descriptive of the Virginia Colony, years after the restoration of Charles II.:

"I thank God there are no free schools or printing; and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years; for learning has brought heresy and disobedience and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best Government. God keep us from both."

In 1688, a great majority of the people of Virginia belonged to the Established Church, and the preaching of Dissenters was prohibited; Quakers were banished, and if they returned were punished with death, by statute. Adultery and fornication were punished by a fine of one thousand dollars for the first offence, and 500 pounds of tobacco for the second. Women convicted of slander were ducked, if the husband did not redeem them by a money-mulct. At this period there was not a bookseller's shop in Virginia; and even at the beginning of the XVIIIth century there was not one in Virginia, Maryland or Carolina, only one in New York, while Boston had five printing offices and many book-shops.

The Puritans landed at New Plymouth, November 9th, 1620, but they intended to settle on the Hudson River. Their Dutch Captain, it is said, was bribed to land them further to the north, so as not to interfere with the Dutch settlement on the Hudson, which had been established some years previous. These Plymouth Rock emigrants were mostly "Brownists" or "Independents," who had been persecuted in England and fled to Holland; and while there purchased the right of the Plymouth Company to colonize a portion of their American possessions.

Robert Brown was an English clergyman, who, being censured by the Established Church in 1586, railed against the Bishops and the ordination of ministers. He was persecuted as a dangerous fanatic and repeatedly imprisoned. He roamed about exultingly proclaiming that he had been incarcerated in thirty-two different prisons. His proselytes naturally increased, and he emigrated, with his followers, to Zealand. Here his Church was soon dissolved, and he returned to England, rejoined the Established Church, became dissolute, and finally ended his days in indolence and contempt. The followers of this same Robert Brown were at first called Brownists, and then Independents. Those who fled from England to Holland called themselves Brownists. And when they were about leaving Delft Haven to plant in the New World, their good Pastor Robinson, in his farewell sermon, urged them "to abandon, avoid, and shake off the name of Brownists; 'tis a mere nick-name and a brand for making religion and professors of it odious to the Christian world."

In 1637 it was customary in Boston to hold meetings to consider the sermon of the previous Sunday and argue the doctrinal points. Females were not allowed to participate in the discussions, and Anne Hutchinson, a strong-minded married woman, determined that she would no longer be debarred from joining in the debates. As the Scripture enjoins "the elder women to teach the younger," she established separate female assemblies. She was called the Nonesuch, and her feminine gatherings were styled Gossippings—a word before that time of respectable import, but from thence consigned to contempt and ridicule. She was cordially esteemed by John Cotton and Governor Vance, and became the leader of a sect. She was banished from Massachusetts, went to Rhode Island, and was finally killed by the Indians. Her followers were guilty of the grossest vices and immoralities.

From 1634 to 1644 the Council and Freemen of Massachusetts assembled together, forming the General Court. Afterward the Governor and Council assembled apart from the Freemen, making two branches of Legislature.

In Massachusetts, Jesuits and Romish priests were banished, and importation of "that cursed sect"—Quakers—prohibited. On the Sabbath all persons were forbidden to run or walk, "except reverently to and from church," or to profane the day by sweeping their houses, cooking, or shaving. Mothers were commanded not to kiss their children on "that sacred day," and a fine was imposed on any one "observing any such day as Christmas."

In 1646, any person who kissed a person in the street, even as an honest salute, was flogged, and this punishment was inflicted as late as the middle of the eighteenth century. No man was allowed to keep a tavern, unless he was of good character and competent estate. In 1638 there were but two licensed Inns in Boston. When a stranger entered an Inn, an officer followed; and if he called for more grog than the officer thought he could bear, it was forbidden, and a less quantity administered. All persons were required to dress according to their fortune, or be fined by the Grand Jury. Women were fined for cutting their hair like a man, or having it hung loosely over the face. Idleness, lying, swearing and drunkenness were punished by whipping, etc. Young women were required to *spin* as much as the Selectmen prescribed, or be fined. Any person "courting a maid without her parents' counsel" was fined and imprisoned. A very few persons had the title of, Mr. and fewer that of *Esquire*. The usual appellations were Goodman and Goodwife. Associations were formed, and sanctioned by law, to suppress drinking healths, wearing long hair and periwigs. It is now recorded, by way of illustration, I suppose, that brewing was prohibited on Saturday, because the beer would work on Sunday.

The first three children baptized in Boston were Joy, Recompense and Pity, and the following baptismal names were very common: Faith, Hope, Charity, Deliverance, Dependence, Preserved, Content, Prudence, Patience, Thankful, Hateevil, Holdfast, and the like.

In 1642, some Puritan preachers visited Virginia and were ordered to leave forthwith, by a proclamation of Gov. Berkeley.

In 1642, the Colonies of New Plymouth, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Haven entered into a league of "perpetual confidence, offensive and defensive," under the title of "The United Colonies of New England."

In 1654, a mint was created for coining silver money, in Boston, by Provincial authority. Maryland is the only other Colony that ever coined money.

In 1651, the Baptists first made their appearance in Massachusetts, led by Obadiah Holmes. They were charged with gross immoralities, adjudged a nuisance, and banished the province. The President of Harvard College embraced the new tenets, and was dismissed. —*Commercial Register.*

COVENANTERS OF NEW JERSEY.

[GRAHAME, in his History of the United States, referring to the early peopling of the territory on the other side of the Hudson, says "a great many inhabitants of Scotland emigrated to East Jersey, and enriched American society with a valuable accession of virtue that had been refined by adversity, and of piety invigorated by persecution." The circumstances causing and attendant upon this emigration are little known. From the "Contributions to East Jersey History," by Mr. Whitehead, recently published by the Appletons, we make the following interesting extract.]

In December, 1685, an arrival of more than ordinary interest added to the busy animation of the new settlement. A vessel freighted with Scots—men upon whom persecution had wrought its work of purification, and whose souls had been tempered for patient endurance by sore trials and misfortunes—anchored in the harbour after a long and disastrous voyage of fifteen weeks; the circumstances of which, with the events attending the embarkation of the emigrants, are deserving of special notice.

As early as 1662, we find among those who suffered for conscience' sake in submitting to the authority of Cromwell, Sir John Scot, of Scotstarbet in Edinburghshire; Middleton, the lord-commissioner, inflicting upon him a fine of six thousand pounds. Such a parentage renders it less remarkable that, when, on the 25th June, 1674, a decree passed against those who "kept conventicles," we should find the son of Scotstarbet among those who were amenable to its provisions. Among those who appeared before the Council, and acknowledged that they had frequented the conventicles of Mr. John Welsh, Mr. Samuel Arnot and others, and who scorned to secure their liberty by taking the oath of supremacy, was George Scot, of Pitlochie, who was not only fined, in common with his companions, for the offence of which they were alike guilty—his penalty being no less than a thousand pounds—but, for his "alleged impertinent and extravagant carriage before the Council," was further fined five hundred merks; and not until these fines were paid was he liberated from prison; and on the 23d July he was again fined a thousand pounds "for harbouring and resetting" the same John Welsh.

The bearing of these provisions may be gathered from the following. No "outed ministers or others" were allowed to preach or expound scripture, or pray anywhere but in their own families. A contrary course subjected both ministers and hearers to imprisonment or fines, even wives and children being made subject to the latter, and to imprisonment also, were the fines not paid; the master or mistress of the house where the conventicle was held being fined double the rates of the others. The "Field Conventicles," which were peculiarly obnoxious, were specified to be not merely meetings in the open fields, but "meetings in a house for prayer and preaching, where more meet than the house contains, and some are without doors." The minister and convocator of such a meeting "shall be punished," so read the act, "with death and confiscation of goods," and the fines imposed upon the hearers were double in amount to those named for attendants on house conventicles.

On the 8th February, 1677, Scot was summoned before the Council, and sent to the Bass prison a second time, for, notwithstanding the experience he had already of the consequences, he again had been "at conventicles"; and on the 7th August following, his wife, Margaret Rigg (Lady Pitlochie), not appearing before the Council when cited for the same offence, was fined a thousand merks. In October the Committee for public affairs advised the Council to liberate Scot and others from the Bass, upon their giving bonds to "compear" when called, and it appears that Scot did give bonds in the sum of ten thousand merks "to confine himself within his own lands, and not to keep conventicles," and was thereupon released.

On the 14th May, 1670, Scot was again brought before the Council, and, having refused to depose as to his attendance or non-attendance at conventicles, the lords held him as having confessed, and directed his securities to pay three thousand merks, leaving the balance of the ten thousand to abide his future behaviour, allowing him the next day to return to his estate. In February, 1680, he was fined seven hundred pounds "for absence from the King's host," and subsequently—but at what time, or for what special offence, has not been ascertained—was again, for the third time, imprisoned in the Bass.

Well might he say, as he did afterwards, that there were "several in the kingdom who, upon account of their not going that length in conformity required of them by the law, did live very uneasie"; and natural was it for him to turn his thoughts towards that land where he and they might "freely enjoy their own principles without hazard or the least trouble," longing for the wings of a dove that he might flee away and be at rest. From his confinement in the Bass he addressed a petition to the Council, praying for his release, engaging to "go to the plantations," and promising to take with him his wife's cousin, Archibald Riddell, one of the obnoxious preachers—offering to become his security in the sum of five thousand merks. This petition was acted on April 1, 1684, and the Laird of Pitlochie found himself once more at liberty."

This liberty was employed by him in preparing "The Model of the Government of East New Jersey in America," to which we are indebted for a large portion of the information which has come down to us respecting the condition of East Jersey at that time, the character of the settlers, and the circumstances which attended their emigration from Scotland. His position in society, his connection with many of the first families of the kingdom, and the persecutions to which he had been subjected, which, of course, increased his notoriety, all tended to secure for his work much more consideration from his countrymen than would have been the case had the author been less distinguished; and when, adding example to precept, he announced his intention of embarking, with his family, for the newly-discovered asylum for the oppressed, it is not surprising that many should have associated themselves with him in the undertaking.

The approbation of "those in authority" was obtained, and on the 14th February the Council authorized Scot by warrant to transport "to the plantations" a hundred of the prisoners confined at Glasgow, Edinburgh and Stirling, if they were willing to go, excluding those who were "heritors above one hundred pounds of rent"; and such persons as were under bonds to appear before them when called were to have those bonds returned should they join him.

Thus authorized, the Laird of Pitlochie proceeded to collect his company; and, under date of 7th August, he requests the Council to transfer to him a large number of persons who had been banished to Jamaica (of which number, however, only twelve were granted him), having already obtained fifty prisoners, and engaged several workmen, to go with him to New Jersey.

Under dates of August 17th, 21st, and 25th, one hundred and five persons who had refused the oath of allegiance to the King, or had been previously banished, and then in the tolbooth of Leith, were ordered to be delivered to Scot, to be transported to East Jersey, on his giving security to land them there, as, by a certificate from the governor, or deputy-governor, might be made to appear, prior to September, 1686; the penalty to be five hundred merks in case of failure in any instance. Other persons were afterwards assigned to him in like manner, and some, previously named, prohibited from embarking.

Scot, as early as May, had chartered the "Henry and Francis of Newcastle, a ship of three hundred and fifty Tun and twenty great Guns, Richard Hutton, Master," but it was not until the 5th September, 1685, that the vessel left the harbour of Leith, the banished persons having been on board for some time; the whole number being near two hundred.

The charge for transportation, as publicly announced, was five pounds sterling for each adult, and to each of those who were unable to pay for their passage was promised 25 acres of land and a suit of new clothes on the completion of four years of service, to those who advanced the requisite amount. Many of the passengers of the "Henry and Francis" were consequently such as were known at a later period of American history as "Redemptioners."

The vessel sailed from the harbour of Leith on the 5th September, 1685. We hear of no untoward event until after she had got beyond "the Land's End," when a fever began to prevail with virulence, particularly among the prisoners, many of whom were sick when they came on board, and the health of the others was endangered by the condition of the provisions laid in by the Captain; the meat, owing probably to the length of time which had elapsed since the vessel was chartered, becoming offensive and uneatable. A month elapsed, and the fever assumed a malignant type. Few escaped it, and on some days as many as three and four bodies were committed to the deep. Nearly seventy died. Among them was the Laird of Pitlochie himself, and his wife, with her sister-in-law Lady Aithernie, and her two children.

Death and unwholesome food were not the only evils the unfortunate emigrants had to encounter. Wodrow represents the conduct of the Captain as being most cruel; extending even to the devising of measures to interfere with their performance of religious services. The ship, too, sprang aleak twice, and calms and storms added to their anxiety and distress.

On the death of Scot, the direction of the voyage devolved upon John Johnstone, whom Wodrow calls Scot's "son-in-law"—which it is probable he was not at that time—and we are told that he was urged by the Captain to change the course of the vessel towards Virginia, or to the island of Jamaica, either place presenting better opportunities for the employment of servants than New Jersey; Hutton offering, as an inducement, to charge himself with the disposal of the prisoners, and to account to him for them "in bulk" [in cargo or productions of the country]. What attention Mr. Johnstone paid to these overtures is not definitely stated, but there is an evident desire to impress the reader with the idea that he acceded to the project, for, "when they are thus treating," says our author, "and near an issue, very much for the advantage of the passengers and prisoners, the wind turns straight for New Jersey, and they were forced to sail with it." It is scarcely necessary, with a knowledge of all the circumstances which, from the first conception of the voyage, pointed out New Jersey as its termination, and of the heavy obligations entered into by Scot that such it should be, to proffer a refutation of the insinuated perfidy.

From The National Era.

THE BURIAL OF BARBER.

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

Bear him, comrades, to his grave;
Never over one more brave
Shall the prairie grasses weep,
In the ages yet to come,
When the millions in our room
What we sow in tears shall reap.

Bear him up the icy hill,
With the Kansas frozen still
As his noble heart, below,
And the land he came to till
With a freeman's thews and will,
And his poor hut roofed with snow!

One more look of that dead face,
Of his murder's ghastly trace!
One more kiss, oh, widowed one!
Lay your left hands on his brow,
Lift your right hands up, and vow
That his work shall yet be done.

Patience, friends! The eye of God
Every path by Murder trod
Watches, lidless, day and night;
And the dead man in his shroud,
And his widow weeping loud,
And our hearts, are in sight.

Every deadly threat that swells
With the roar of gambling bells,
Every brutal jest and jeer,
Every wicked thought and plan
Of the cruel heart of man,
Though but whispered, He can hear!

You in suffering, they in crime,
Wait the just award of time,
Wait the vengeance that is due;
Not in vain a heart shall break,
Not a tear for Freedom's sake
Fall unheeded: God is true.

While the flag with stars bedecked
Threatens where it should protect,
And the Law shakes hands with Crime,
What is left ye but to wait,
Match your patience to your fate,
And abide the better time?

Patience, friends! The human heart
Everywhere shall take your part,
Everywhere for you shall pray;
On your side are nature's laws,
And God's life is in the cause
That you suffer for to-day.

Well, to suffer is divine;
Pass the watchword down the line,
Pass the countersign: "ENDURE,"
Not to him who rashly dares,
But to him who nobly bears,
Is the victor's garland sure.

Frozen earth to frozen breast,
Lay our slain one down to rest;
Lay him down in hope and faith,
And above the broken sod,
Once again, to Freedom's God,
Pledge yourselves for life or death—

That the State whose walls ye lay,
In your blood and tears, to-day,
Shall be free from bonds of shame,
And your goodly land untrod
By the feet of Slavery, shod
With cursing as with flame!

Plant the Buckeye on his grave,
For the hunter of the slave
In its shadow cannot rest;
And let martyr-mound and tree
Be your pledge and guaranty
Of the freedom of the West!

NAMES OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS.

AFTER a child is born, the next matter of importance is to give it a name; a puzzling subject of consideration very often, for some names become stale and even ludicrous, and we do not like to perpetuate them in the family tree. In Puritan times there was a vigorous effort made to introduce the Scripture names, and the world in England was for one or two generations inhabited by Isaiahs, Jeremiahs, Nathaniels and Obadiahs; but they did not take; and now they are associated with cant and hypocrisy. On the stage they represent the Praise-God-Barebones of dramatic entertainments. A few have resisted the tide of popular opposition; but even against many of those who have survived, the tide is very strong. Peter is almost driven out; and it is a curious fact that no Pope has ever chosen to go by the name of Peter, although each prides himself in being his successor, and invariably chooses his own reigning name at his election. Few Peters now have moral courage to call their children Peter.

The press too has been running a muck against John for a long while, and it will succeed. It first fastens itself on a footman, a groom or a pot-boy, and, by thus vulgarizing it, lowers its reputation. There is, perhaps, no real intention of persecuting a name in so doing; it is merely a convenience to have a few characteristic names for menials, in literature, just as there are characteristic names for heroes and heroines; and every novel-reader knows by instinct that when a John and a Bertrand are introduced into a tale, the Bertrand is more likely to be the hero than the John. James also is now pretty thoroughly assaulted, and especially by transforming the name into Jeames, that ridiculous mode of pronouncing it so prevalent in Scotland and the north of England, where they still continue to murder English with most outstretched conscience, though perhaps not more outrageously than they do it in some southern provinces, where it is almost a foreign language.

Peter, James and John—only think of it! It is worth your serious consideration! There is a deadset against these three names, though once on a time they stood foremost in Christendom. And Gothic names, the names of the northern barbarians who desolated the empire of the Roman world, are now in the ascendant—the names of those sturdy, brute-force men, who carried bears' heads and griffins' heads on their crests, and prided themselves in having their shields supported by brute beasts. These are the men of name and repute: and to this day the gentlemen of Christendom rejoice in the ferocious heads, the daggers, and the bloody hands of the crest and the shield, as the proudest evidences of rank and family.

A few old Bible names are still in repute, as David and Daniel, and Mary and Elizabeth (in olden times it was Elisheba, Aaron's wife), and Anne still holds as good a place as if it were gothic or barbarian; but Mary surpasses all other names in universality; it belongs not only to women throughout all Christendom, but even to men, who bear it as a second name. Thus, for instance, the Queen of Spain's name is Mary, her husband's name is Mary, her mother's name is Mary, and even her sister's name is Mary; her uncle and all her cousins are Marys, and her cousins' children are Marys, in fact all the royal family of Spain, males and females, are Marys, with scarcely an exception. This arises from the great devotion of that Bourbon race to the Virgin, a devotion which has gone to such an excess of fanaticism as even to confound the sex of her name by applying it to males and females indiscriminately. The males, however, have the decency to hide their female names, ashamed, perhaps, to expose themselves publicly to the world in petticoats.

It is difficult to discover the reason why names should go out of fashion. Peter, for instance—why should that be so exceptionable? it is a musical, well-sounding name. There is nothing equivocal about it; it has two syllables; its meaning is good. In fact it has almost every attribute that a name requires to give it currency and popularity. Judging from these alone, without reference to certain indescribable associations, of which it is difficult to form a definite idea, one would naturally conclude that Peter is a first-rate name; and yet, somehow or other, it has lost its credit, and is going out, like Cæsar and Pompey, once names of renown. Has it been too much used? we do not think so. Neither amongst popes nor amongst kings has it ever been a favourite. In Spain, Portugal and Russia it has attained to sovereignty, but Papal, French and English royalists have religiously abstained from it; nor can we discover any reason why, for Pietro and Pierre, the Italian and French for Peter, are not more like stone in these languages than in Spanish, while in English Peter conveys no idea of stone, and is not equivocal nor associated with anything offensive.

We can easily see a reason why no woman should be called Jezebel, for it is a name of offence, and would be really a misfortune to a young girl; or why no man should be called Cain, which is ever exclusively associated with the idea of murder; and no man perhaps would like the raillery attached to the name of Jonah, although the name is really beautiful, and has been borne by Sir Jonah Barrington; but one of the finest of all names, Lucifer, once borne by a bishop, and signifying the Light-bringer, the Bright and Morning Star, is now universally disused, chiefly, we suspect, because mothers believe that it is the devil's name, which it really is not. It is one of the greatest compliments you can pay any man to call him Lucifer, for it is really the brightest of all names, and they only are worthy of bearing it who bring light into the world. It is a popular error entirely that has excluded it from the baptismal font. The name has now been degraded by being applied to phosphoric matches, which certainly deserve it, but it was a pity to lose it as a Christian name of men, and it is not at all improbable that it will soon be revived.

But we should not wonder if many clergymen would refuse to baptize a child by the name of Lucifer, and yet they could give no scriptural or theological reason for refusing. Not long ago a child was taken to the Lincoln Union to be baptized, and the clergyman, an Irishman, refused to baptize her by the name of Elisamon, because he said it was not a name, and he baptized her Charlotte on his own responsibility. A piece of assurance on his part, and which he could only have practised on poor parents; but what would such a man have said if a boy were taken to be baptized Lucifer, which is a name, and a name which belongs to no evil spirit, as is generally supposed, and one by which a bishop of the Christian Church was baptized, ordained and consecrated Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari. Elisamon is certainly not a good name for a girl. It has not a feminine look; but it is as good for a girl as Mary for a man; and though parents ought to be advised in respect to children's names, they have a right to invent new names if they choose to do so. Not long ago a child was baptized by the name of Forever. The clergyman, no doubt, paused and wondered, but he did not refuse. It was new and strange, but there is nothing illegal or impious in it—it was only eccentric.

It is well, however, to avoid all eccentricity in names; many suffer severely for life, owing to the silly and thoughtless humour of parents in this respect; and in the last and previous centuries, when wit was low, and humour coarse and boyish, many ridiculous names were given to foundlings which have now become established amongst us. It was cruel to bestow such names on poor children. It is a cruelty that is perpetuated from generation to generation. To inflict a transient pain on a single person is really a trifle compared to it, for all bodily pain is short-lived when compared to one mentally injured, but a mental pain of this description is propagated with a perpetual increase to an indefinite period. We believe that modern times are more considerate in this respect, and that the guardians of the poor would shrink from imposing an unseemly name on a foundling or child whose parents are unknown.

It is astonishing how very few Christian names there are to supply the million. How they do ring the changes on the few common names that they have! The names in ancient times were more numerous, but then they wanted the surnames. There is only one Abraham for all the history of the Jews, one Isaac, one Jacob, one David, one Solomon. The repetition of a name is a rare thing. They were ever inventing new ones, and their names were generally words of meaning, such as Welcome, a man's name in the United States, or Patience, Prudence, Charity, women's names in England, though now chiefly confined to the lower classes. The ancients could not have distinguished one another with so small a supply of names, that is first names, as we have; but when the Roman system of double or triple names was introduced, the first or calling names became rapidly less numerous; so that now in almost every family, you find a Charles, a George, a Richard, a William, or a Robert; a Mary, Elizabeth, Anne, Julia, or Charlotte, and a few more; the number is very small. In many families there are two or three of each, sometimes four, grandma, mother and daughter, all of the same name, as if there was a dearth of words to distinguish them. But the moderns are fond of namesakes, and are all conservatives in respect to names, and jealous of the introduction of new ones into the family line. Even when John the Baptist was named, his kinsman wondered at the name, because none of his kindred was known by that name. The practice is therefore very old, though we find no traces of it in patriarchal times; and it has become more and more a fixed and popular practice by the lapse of time.

Nevertheless, there are liberals, radicals and innovators, in this as in other departments of human fancy. There are men who delight in introducing entirely new names into their families, who choose none of their relatives' names, but choose historical and patriotic names, or who give surnames for Christian names by way of a change. A few even invent new ones.

In either choosing or inventing, special care should be had to the music of the Christian and surname; if possible, the first should never end with the same letter with which the other begins. Thus for instance, Peter Robson would just be called Peter Hobson in England, and the two names would be confounded, and Robert Taylor is just the same as Robber Taylor; not that these two will ever be confounded, but a name is cleaner and purer when it is well relieved, and when it does not blend its component parts into a pun or an equivoque. Certain letters blend more sweetly than others, therefore both names should be tried together. This, we believe, is very rarely done. The Christian name alone is considered—Henry or William, or Julia or Charlotte—without any reference to what follows, and then we have William Manning or Charlotte Ray (*i. e.* Charlotte Tray, or some other unmusical combination which might easily have been avoided. Robert Manning is good, but William Manning is not. The first is well relieved, the other is confused. The ear of every person is able at once to perceive the superiority of one to the other, but people don't think of it. Simple as the rule is, it seems to be almost universally unknown, and we often perceive the want of this little bit of knowledge in the lines of poets and poetesses who send their first and second attempts to us, and who mar the beauty of their language by such unmusical combinations of letters which never can read sweetly.

Not long ago we read of a gentleman yclept Silas Stokes, Esq.; what a hissing of esses! It would require a serpent almost to pronounce such a name, and the title of Esq. does not improve it. Surely that man's parents either had no musical ear, or they never thought of the Stokes at all when they determined to give him the name of Silas. It was the worst name they could have chosen, worse than Charles. Robert or William, or any name without an *s*, would have been preferable; but perhaps, for the sake of some old uncle, and an expected inheritance, the child was hissed into the church and the state by baptism and registration. Such a name as Mark Stark is very different from Silas's; but still it is eccentric, and somewhat ridiculous from the rhyme of it. It is impossible to pass by such a name without notice. Moreover, it is easily remembered. There may be some advantage in having such a distinction. It helps one to immortality. John Stark we should never have remembered, nor do we remember Mark personally, though we have seen him often. We only remember his name; it is difficult to forget such a name, for one is apt to speak of it and fix it in the memory.

When one is born to a monosyllabic name, it is better to give two or more syllables to the Christian name for euphony. If Sir Christopher Wren had been merely Ben Wren, he would not have seemed so dignified a personage. Even a wig would not have magnified such a tom-tit pair of monosyllables into greatness. Augustus or Adolphus coupled with Wren makes a respectable pair; but Ben and Wren are like two little spouses toddling along and almost walking between people's legs—Kit Wren was no doubt his schoolboy name, and Benjamin Wren would have done as well as Christopher, but we merely suppose that Ben was the total when we regard its insignificance. There is a grandeur in size, and it is always well to have a long name for state occasions, like a long-tailed coat instead of a jacket when invited to a dress party. What Nebuchadnezzar's pet name was when his mother nursed him is difficult to discover amid the ruins of Babylon; Neb most probably, but such a name for a great monarch, the founder of civilization, would have been ridiculous. But Mahar-shallal-hash-bazz would make no man great, even though clothed in purple. Why, we cannot say, except that the *hash* is ridiculous in English ears, but it may be a dignified syllable in the ears of an Oriental. German, Polish and Russian names are to us undignified, and Chinese Yings, Yongs, Hongs and Kongs are all ridiculous. No doubt our own are so to them, and they would laugh heartily if they were told that one of our greatest philosophers was Lord Hogsflesh, or Lord Pork, or Lord Bacon; it matters not which when translated into Chinese. We get familiarized with awful names, to which nothing but long use and wont could reconcile us, and why should not other nations do the same? But there are generally a few which get stigmatized amongst ourselves for some unaccountable reason. Hogg and Hoare are more respectable in England than Snooks, but why they should be so is not easily explained; nor is it easy to say why Humphrey has never taken in England, except that Hum and Humph are component parts of it. But Geoffrey's component parts are good enough, and it has been desecrated into old Jeffrey. Grizzell is reasonably rejected, and Tabitha reminds one too strongly of a cat; but there are numerous pretty names which have not been brought into modern use at all, and which have not been vulgarized, and it is surprising how very few we are content to do with, as if we were afraid of burdening our memories with too long a list. We seem to relish the prestige of names, and prefer those which have been long domesticated, and which have already found their pet abbreviations familiarized as household words in family circles. It is so also, we believe, in other countries. There are a few favourite calling-names which prevail even in Eastern lands, and the distinctions are perceived in the family names of the Western world, which are numerous, and in the addition of the father's name in the East. This no doubt arises from personal prepossessions, and new names can scarcely be expected, except from those who have no kindred and no affections, no grateful recollections, and no patriotic enthusiasm. Such, we hope, are a very small number.

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

A Berlin tailor, a lively speculator, exhibits a full Paris Congress costume for fashionable attraction. It consists of an Orloff greatcoat, a Walewski evening frock, a Cavour waistcoat, Clarendon small-clothes, and Manteuffel cravat, with Aali Pasha shirt-front, and a Boul claque.

——A STRANGE BLADE.—An American Rough, whose name is Walt Whitman, and who calls himself a "Kosmos," has been publishing a mad book under the title of "Leaves of Grass." We can only say that these "Leaves of Grass" are fully worthy to be put on a level with that heap of rubbish called "Fern Leaves," by Fanny Fern, and similarly "green stuff." The fields of American literature want weeding dreadfully.

——SABBATH OBSERVANCE IN GERMANY.—The States of Oldenberg have agreed to a law for the better observance of the Sabbath. According to this, all out-door labour, all noisy inn-door labour, and all places of public recreation are forbidden until after the termination of morning divine service, that is until about mid-day. An attempt was made to extend the restriction until after evening service, but it was rejected.

——The flute with which John Bunyan beguiled the tediousness of his captive hours is now in the poeession of Mr. Howels, tailor, Gainsborough. In appearance it does not look unlike the leg of a stool—out of which, it is said, that Bunyan, while in prison, manufactured it. When the turnkey, attracted by the sound of music, entered his cell to ascertain, if possible, the cause of the harmony, the flute was replaced in the stool, and by this means detection was avoided.—*Lincolnshire Times.*

——The Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem, has been purchased by a Madame Polack, the widow of a wealthy banker, of the Hebrew persuasion, at Konigsberg, in Prussia. This lady intends to beautify the place and to improve the whole neighbourhood, at her sole expense. The first thing she has done was to plant the whole area with a grove of olives, and thus restore it to the original state to which it owes its name. The olive tree thrives well in that locality, and, though it takes many years before arriving at a state of maturity, and sixteen years before bearing any fruit at all, it requires but little or no tending, and lasts for several hundred years.

——"It has been my lot," said Sir Roderick Murchison, in speaking at the late meeting of the Printers' Pension Society, of the acquirements and merits of the compositors and readers, "to give more trouble to the printer than most contemporary writers, and I have always admired the address, ability, and tact of the working men, who, if patience be a heavenly virtue, ought never to have had the name applied to them that is in common use. It is to an author like myself that the term might in common honesty be applied of printers' devil. I entertain the same regard for the man who works the types, and the reader who supervises the proofs, as I do for the short-hand writer who renders my crude speech into good and racy English—a gratitude, I will say, which is seldom expressed by the very numerous public orators who owe the debt."

——An amusing story is going the round of society in Dublin. A certain Dean, who is desirous of standing well with the Castle, and who has frequent interviews with the Lord Lieutenant, gave his Excellency a letter to read, which he had just received from a gentleman in the Crimea, formerly his Excellency's private Secretary. His Excellency read with much satisfaction till he came to a postscript, which, it seems, had escaped the Rev. Dean's notice, and then his face darkened, and he asked the Dean whether he had read the whole letter. "Yes," replied his reverence; "very amusing, isn't it?" His Excellency returned the letter, and the confounded Dean then read, "Can it be true that that old ass, Carlisle, is going to marry Rose ——?" naming a young lady, one of the belles of Dublin. Whether his Excellency, in anger, or the Dean, in distress, disclosed the story, is not known. We can only say that the tale is generally credited, and excites unbounded merriment in the gay circles of the Irish capital.—*London Press.*

——PHOTOGRAPHY UNDER WATER.—In a late number of the *Journal of the Society of Arts*, Mr. Thompson (of Weymouth) gives an account of the means he adopted for taking a photograph of the bottom of the sea in Weymouth Bay, at a depth of three fathoms. It appears that the camera was placed in a box with a plate-glass front, and a moveable shutter to be drawn up when the camera was sunk to the bottom. The camera, being focussed in this box on land for objects in the foreground at about ten yards, or other suitable distance, was let down from a boat to the bottom of the sea, carrying with it the collodion plate prepared in the ordinary way. When at the bottom, the shutter of the box was raised, and the plate was thus exposed for about ten minutes. The box was then drawn into the boat, and the image developed in the usual manner. A view was thus taken of the rocks and weeds lying in the bottom of the bay. Mr. Thompson anticipates that it will be a ready and inexpensive means of arriving at a knowledge of the condition of piers of bridges, piles, structures, and rocks under water.

——HOLY WEEK AT JERUSALEM.—The *Univers* publishes a letter from Jerusalem, of the 13th April. The ceremonies of the holy week had passed off with unusual calm, chiefly attributable to the fact that the Easter week of the Greeks and Latins did not coincide this year; whilst the Greeks were partially disarmed by the moderation evinced by the Latins in forbearing to claim the recognition of many privileges and rights of which they had been so long deprived. A terrible hurricane had raged for three days over Jerusalem, and had seriously injured the great dome of the temple—already so out of repair. The internal ceiling had given way in several places, and the rain fell with such violence in the great rotunda that the priests were compelled to raise their robes from the wet during the procession of Holy Thursday. On another occasion, the rain drove the priests from refuge to refuge, to the great sorrow of the forty or fifty pilgrims from the west, who deplored the condition of the most holy place of worship in the universe. The ceremonies of the holy week were accomplished with their usual solemnity, and sermons were pronounced in the French, English, Italian, and Spanish languages; in Turkish (by an Armenian priest) and in Arabic by the curé of Jerusalem.

——DOMESTIC LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES.—Rude were the manners then: man and his wife ate off the same trencher; a few wooden-handled knives, with blades of rugged iron, were a luxury for the great; candles unknown. A servant girl held a torch at supper; one or, at most, two mugs of coarse brown earthenware formed all the drinking apparatus in a house. Rich gentlemen wore clothes of unlined leather. Ordinary persons scarcely ever touched flesh meat. Noble mansions drank little or no wine in summer; a little corn seemed wealth. Women had trivial marriage portions; even ladies dressed extremely plain. The chief part of a family's expense was what the males spent in arms and horses, none of which, however, were either very good or very showy; and grandees had to lay out money on their lofty towers. In Dante's comparatively polished times, ladies began to paint their cheeks by way of finery, going to the theatre, and to use less assiduity in spinning and plying their distaff. What is only a symptom of prosperity in large is the sure sign of ruin in small States. So, in Florence he might very well deplore what in London or Paris would be to praise or cause a smile. Wretchedly indeed plebeians hovelled; and if noble castles were cold and dreary everywhere, they were infinitely worse in Italy, from the horrible modes of torture and characteristic cruelty, too frightful to dwell on. Few of the infamous structures built at the time treated of stand at present; yet their ruins disclose rueful corners.—*History of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.*

——DEAD LANGUAGES.—There is no more striking instance of the silent and imperceptible changes brought about by what is called "time" than that of a language becoming dead. To point out the precise period at which Greek or Latin ceased to be a living language would be as